









THE  
FORTNIGHTLY  
REVIEW.

EDITED BY  
JOHN MORLEY.

VOL. XIX. NEW SERIES.  
JANUARY 1 TO JUNE 1, 1876.  
(VOL. XXV. OLD SERIES.)

LONDON:  
CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193, PICCADILLY.  
1876.

*[The Right of Translation is reserved.]*

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO., LIMITED,  
CITY ROAD.

# CONTENTS.

AUTHOR	PAGE
ABBOTT, F. S. . . . .	The Catholic Peril in America . . . . . 385
ALCOCK, Sir Rutherford . . . .	Western Powers and the East . . . . . 46
	China and its Foreign Relations . . . . . 652
BAGEHOT, Walter . . . . .	English Political Economy. I. . . . . 215
	" " II. . . . . 720
BRIDGE, C. A. . . . .	A Glimpse of the Korea . . . . . 96
	Early Autumn on the Lower Yang-Tze . . . . . 830
BRODRICK, Hon. G. C. . . . .	What are Liberal Principles? . . . . . 174
BRYCE, James . . . . .	A Few Words on the Oxford University Bill . . . . . 771
BUNCE, J. T. . . . .	James Northcote, R.A. . . . . 861
CAMPBELL, Sir George . . . .	Our Dealings in Egypt . . . . . 157
	Finances of India . . . . . 514
CHAMBERLAIN, J. . . . .	A Right Method with the Publicans . . . . . 631
CHESTER, G. J. . . . .	Some Truths about Egypt . . . . . 580
COOKSON, Montague . . . . .	The New Judicature . . . . . 277
DALE, R. W. . . . .	Disestablishment . . . . . 311
DICEY, Edward . . . . .	The Copyright Question . . . . . 126
EDITOR . . . . .	M. Taine's New Work . . . . . 370
	Macaulay . . . . . 494
	Some Recent Books of Travel . . . . . 742
FOWLER, Professor . . . . .	On Examinations . . . . . 418
HARTSHORNE, B. F. . . . .	The Weddas . . . . . 406
HAVELOCK, Sir H. . . . .	A National Training to Arms . . . . . 430
JACKSON, R. R. . . . .	India and Lancashire . . . . . 877
JEVONS, Professor . . . . .	Cruelty to Animals . . . . . 671
LEWES, G. H. . . . .	Spiritualism and Materialism. I. . . . . 479
	" " II. . . . . 707
MACDONELL, John . . . . .	German Railways: A Comparison . . . . . 67
MARSHALL, Alfred . . . . .	On Mr. Mill's Theory of Value . . . . . 591
MEREDITH, George . . . . .	A Ballad of Past Meridian . . . . . 829

AUTHOR		PAGE
MORISON, J. C. . . . .	Madame de Maintenon. I. . . . .	603
	"                  "                  II. . . . .	758
MÜLLER, Max . . . . .	On Spelling . . . . .	556
PALGÉ AYE, W. G. . . . .	Dutch Guiana. II. . . . .	191
	"                  "                  III. . . . .	536
PATER, W. H. . . . .	Myth of Demeter and Persophone. I. . . . .	82
	"                  "                  II. . . . .	260
SAINTSBURY, G. . . . .	Modern English Prose . . . . .	243
SHUTTLEWORTH, Sir J. Kay . . . . .	Results of the Education Act . . . . .	685
STANLEY, Hon. E. L. . . . .	The New Domesday Book . . . . .	791
STEPHEN, Leslie . . . . .	An Agnostic's Apology . . . . .	810
SWINBURNE, A. C. . . . .	Three Stages of Shakespeare . . . . .	24
TOLLEMACHE, Hon. L. . . . .	Courage and Death. . . . .	103
	The Upper Engadine . . . . .	340
WHITE, John . . . . .	Laws on Compulsory Education . . . . .	897
WHITE, Horace . . . . .	The Financial Crisis in America . . . . .	810
ZINCKE, F. Barham . . . . .	Channel Islands and Land Tenure . . . . .	1
Home and Foreign Affairs . . . . .	111, 295, 165, 617, 777, 919	

THE  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

— — — — —  
No. CX. NEW SERIES.—FEBRUARY 1, 1876.

OUR DEALINGS WITH EGYPT, AND THE  
POSSIBLE RESULTS.

THE Ministry has not thought proper to give full explanations on the subject of its recent transaction with the Egyptian Government before the meeting of Parliament at the ordinary period, but we have a French official publication and several fragmentary ministerial utterances. It seems hardly likely that the statements in Parliament will add very materially to the main facts which have been already disclosed; the Government must necessarily be very reserved as to political eventualities. It appears, then, not out of place to try to take some account of the general situation in connection with the transaction, before its details are debated. And both because it is with a view to our interests in India that the step has been taken, and because Egypt seems in many respects very closely to resemble an Indian province, I wish to look at the matter more especially from that Indian side with which I have some familiarity.

Whether the measure adopted by the Ministry be right or wrong, I cannot but think that the tone of undoubting and exulting approval, taken by so large a portion of the press, is evidently, and on the face of it, unreasonable. Whatever conclusion we may come to, the matter is beset with difficulties and doubts. The press declared itself while yet the public had formed no opinion whatever. The so-called popular opinion is yet only skin deep. Every one who conversed with many others when the surprise came out must feel that ninety-nine men out of a hundred had taken no side till they read their newspapers.

The facts seem to be simple enough. Owing to our distrust of and opposition to the Canal scheme, almost the whole of the shares offered to the public fell into foreign, principally French hands, and the Canal Company, though properly subject in Egypt to Egyptian laws, has its head-quarters in Paris. On the other hand, it turns out that

we make by far the greatest use of the Canal, and are in that sense interested in it beyond all other nations put together. There is nothing to prevent an English public abounding in money, and at last convinced of the use and great future of the Canal, from remedying the national mistake of former years, by buying shares in the market. But it may be gathered that, owing to the French location, French surroundings, and French management of the Company, a movement of this kind had not yet set in, and the shares were little known and quoted in London.

The Khedive had retained a large proportion of the shares, but had parted with his right to dividends up to the year 1894. He was terribly in want of funds, and was anxious to sell his remaining interest in the shares. That interest had been offered to French capitalists on terms far more favourable than those afterwards given by our Government—viz., for about three and a half millions sterling, on which interest was to be paid by the Khedive till 1894, at 10, 11, or almost any other rate. The offer, however, was not accepted, and so far it cannot be said that the purchase by the British Ministry was immediately necessary. In fact, the distrust of Egyptian finance was so great, that, as respects the part of the bargain which depended on the payment of interest by Egypt, no one was likely to advance the money. Still, the deferred shares had a certain value (about £1,500,000, it seems to be calculated); as one of the last available assets they were being hawked about, and would probably be sold. Since the chief market for such shares was in Paris, they would probably have fallen into French hands. Under those circumstances, our Government stepped in, and gave far better terms than those declined by the French capitalists: four millions, and the money to be advanced on the Khedive's credit, at 5 per cent.

The transaction has two aspects, the commercial and the political. No doubt it would be a very inconvenient situation that the property in the Canal should remain chiefly French, while the customers who use it are chiefly English; a conflict of interests might arise, and possibly some antagonism. It is uncertain when this might be remedied by English purchases in the market. If, then, the Government had simply purchased the deferred shares at their value, or had even given for them a good deal more than their value (the penalty for the mistake we had previously made), I for one should have been inclined to say, "It is a very difficult question; there are obvious inconveniences and dangers attending the position; but the Government was in the best position to judge; I have a certain admiration for the pluck that takes such a responsibility; and at any rate, if it is thought better not to hold the shares, we can put them on the market again, and try to do so in such a way as to make them popular with English buyers." So far, I should not have ventured

on criticism, pending the Government explanations; and I do not propose to pursue this branch of the subject farther at present.

But the political aspect of the question cannot be kept out of view. It is not only that results may follow which cannot be officially discussed; there is something much more direct and immediate than that. It seems to me that too much has been said of the purchase of the Canal shares, and too little of that which is politically much more important—viz., that we have directly subsidised the Khedive. We have lent him £4,000,000 for nineteen years at 5 per cent., when he could not get a smaller sum at 11 per cent., or any other per cent. This it is which gives the proceeding its greatest importance. This great subsidy, taken in conjunction with the deputation to Egypt of a body of high English officials, to inquire into the condition of Egyptian finance, looks very like a kind of financial protectorate of Egypt. The power of the purse is everything, and a financial protectorate would be nothing short of a political protectorate. It did, indeed, at first appear that we had very speedily, effectually, and so far beneficially, exercised the power thus newly acquired, to stop dangerous and expensive Egyptian aggressions in Africa. The withdrawal from campaigns against Zanzibar and Abyssinia seemed to be the first fruits of our influence. Whether this really is so, we shall know presently.

Postponing, however, for the present, the general question whether it is desirable that we should exercise a great political influence in Egypt, the doubt which I wish first to suggest is whether, in a country situated as is Egypt at this moment, a financial protectorate is not the worst and most dangerous form of protectorate.

Let us see the situation in which we are placed. From the part of the arrangement which amounts to an advance of money to the Khedive we cannot go back. We might sell the shares, as Lord Sandhurst suggested, with an undertaking on our part to pay interest to 1894; but this would still leave our interest to recover from the Khedive. As between him and the British Government we cannot recede, we must either recover the interest from him or lose it. We hear nothing of any material guarantee for this interest. If there were such a guarantee, it would amount to our taking a part of Egypt in pledge. If there is no such guarantee, then we can only rank with the other creditors; and it comes to this, that we have embarked in the same boat with them—with them we must sink or swim. We could hardly, in that case, use our influence to obtain payment for ourselves while they remain unpaid. No wonder that Egyptian stocks rose rapidly in the market as soon as it was known that the British Government had made this arrangement with the Khedive, and that they fell as rapidly when there came rumours of a hitch in the arrangement. If Mr. Cave and his staff



are not to interfere seriously in Egyptian finance, if they are only to teach the Egyptians English book-keeping and such pretty things, we have simply become ordinary Egyptian bondholders, without the promise of high interest to set against the risk. If Mr. Cave is to interfere seriously, that interference is naturally construed to be our taking in hand the liquidation of the Egyptian concern. That would be a very difficult job. It would be very likely to end in the accumulation of debt to us; possibly in the necessity for fresh advances to save the concern, and in a growing mortgage on the country which it might be very difficult to settle without foreclosing.

To the Khedive, in one way, British supervision and British advice may be very useful, but in another way our interference is disadvantageous to him, inasmuch as it makes his creditors much more difficult to deal with. Each will then have his pound of flesh, and nothing less, according to the letter of his bond. The debts contracted on terms necessitated by need and bad security will be demanded from the solvent mortgagee who has undertaken the management of the affair. The creditors will seek the combined benefit of bad security and good security—usurious terms and complete fulfilment of them. All that has gone into the pockets of financiers, all the abatements from full price conceded to float the loans, all the high interest, and everything else, go to swell the account far beyond the benefit the Khedive has actually received. There would be a state of things with which we are very familiar in India, when native debts come to be settled by our intervention. In India we are or have been strong enough to make some equitable compromise, but can we so deal with the European money markets? If the Khedive were left to himself, he is, to a certain extent, master of the situation. There is no court in which he can be sued and sold up. If the estate on which advances have been made on usurious terms really cannot pay, then the creditors must take as much as they can get. The man who engages in such risky transactions is well repaid if he really gets something short of his full account. In short, in the event of a breakdown and a stoppage of further loans, the Khedive might compromise with his creditors on terms more favourable than we could do so for him.

To revert to the main object of this paper: we have avowed the maintenance of a passage through Egypt to be a vital principle of our national policy; our Government has intervened in the affairs of the Khedive, lent him money, and purchased a large share in a great Egyptian property; all the world has taken these proceedings to amount to putting on Egypt a sort of British ear-mark, signifying that come what may, if the country is loosed from its present Sovereign-in-chief, we must have a large share in its dis-

posal and management. These latter ideas may or may not be carried more or less far in the minds of individual British statesmen. They are probably not formulated into a definite policy of the Government or of any other party; but, nevertheless, there is no saying how far things may drift in that direction. The Turkish empire may break up; the military power and financial position of Egypt are not sufficient to enable her to stand alone without guidance or protection; it may become a pressing question under what superior control Egypt is to be placed. One very great power has already on a former occasion offered Egypt to England. Some other powers might not dislike such an arrangement. A decision may any day be forced on us. In some political affairs it may be well to let things drift; but when so great responsibilities and so onerous obligations may by the course of events be thrust on us, it is well not to drift into them blindly, but rather to see in what position such a course might land us, and to steer accordingly. I by no means suggest that we are likely to assume any suzerainty over Egypt; but I do wish to consider, in case such an eventuality should become possible, what sort of a prospect the arrangement would afford. If it would be a danger and embarrassment we ought not to do anything which might bring us nearer to it.

I will not attempt to deal with the question as one of European politics, and especially as regards the interests and feelings of France, which would be the great difficulty—with that part of the subject I have no special capacity to deal. But I try to form some idea what kind of an undertaking Egypt, considered as if it were an Asiatic State, would be in case it were thrust upon us by events. In so treating the matter it is only necessary to bear in mind that the situation of Egypt, isolated from Asia and comparatively near Europe, would render necessary a much stronger military force than if it could be attached as an additional province to our existing Indian empire.

Looking at the matter then from the Asiatic side, although our information regarding the population, finances, &c., is not precise, I think we have enough to show pretty clearly that, the debt apart, Egypt would not be a bad or unprofitable country to govern. The people are evidently not a proud and independent people—they have been subject to foreign rule for some three thousand years, much longer even than the Hindoos; and the revenues are very large compared to the culturable area and the population. Behind Egypt, too, there are magnificent possibilities in Africa. I will first look at the finances, for that must after all govern all things.

First, and chiefly, Egypt has that grand Asiatic financial advantage, that the rent (so far at least as it represents the unearned increment) is reserved as the State-fund, and supplies a public revenue sufficient

to defray most of the public expenses. Situated as the country is, so near to European markets, and with a soil of great fertility constantly renewed by a natural manure from the river, the land revenue is very large. In the last statement, put forward apparently on authority, I find that the ordinary land-tax and cognate tithe on date-trees amount to about four and a half millions sterling. This alone would give, from 5,000,000 of people, a land revenue larger than that drawn from the best provinces in India, with a population many times more numerous; thus Bengal, with a population of 65,000,000, land revenue £3,900,000; North-West Provinces, population 31,000,000, land revenue £4,176,000; Madras, population 31,000,000, land revenue £4,354,000.\* It is stated, too, that the ordinary land revenue is at the rate of about £1 1s. 2d. per acre, which would be about ten times the average Indian rate.

Moreover there is a further land revenue entered under the head of "Mokabilah" (but which all statements agree to be an impost on the land), which amounts to upwards of a million and a half, thus giving altogether a land revenue of upwards of 6,000,000 sterling; an amount, derived from so small an area and population, enough to make an Indian financier's mouth water. I should have supposed the extra impost on the land to be a surcharge, such as is common in almost all native States in India, where the actual land revenue is generally made up of an original revenue and extra charges. But a recent occasional correspondent of the *Times* gives an explanation, making the extra land revenue very temporary in its character. I shall notice that shortly.

The other sources of revenue are equally Asiatic in their character. There is no opium revenue, and for the sake of our Indian interests we must hope there never will be. A Government salt monopoly there is, yielding about £300,000, or, if we add a further monopoly of, or tax on, salt fish, £375,000. This gives a rate per head (supposing the estimate of population to be approximate to the truth) of about double the rate of the Indian salt-tax; but it is still far less in proportion than the land revenue.

Further, the Khedive has tried a tax often proposed in India—a tax on tobacco—which has not yielded so much as was expected, but seems to have brought in £257,000.

Then there is the system of trade licenses, the old "moturpha," at one time universal in India and in most Asiatic countries, but piece by piece abolished by us. This yields in Egypt £412,000.

The customs yield £624,000, about one-fourth of our Indian customs, from about one-thirtieth of the population—again a revenue very much larger in proportion.

The remaining revenues consist of miscellaneous items, not very clearly distinguished; revenues of what we should call non-regula-

tion provinces, stated in the lump; octroi, municipalities, and other items which we should possibly class under local taxation; and the income from certain public works, locks, bridges, &c., and, above all, railways. The net income of State railways is now put down at something approaching a million sterling. If this account is given with any accuracy, the Egyptian railways must be among the most profitable in the world, but we have no exact information on this point.

Altogether the authorised statement gives an Egyptian revenue of upwards of ten and a half millions sterling. If we allow of this, one and a half millions as the revenue of municipalities, public works, &c., not usually included in State revenue proper, we shall still have nine millions of public revenue. Assuredly an indigenous government, with such an income at its disposal, *with* decent management, and *without* the unhappy power of extravagant borrowing, ought to be well off in the extreme. The tribute to Turkey is a cheap relief from the liability to foreign war. Apparently the Khedive should have been one of the most prosperous rulers in the world.

When we look to the other side of the account, we find that it is entirely his indebtedness which renders his position so far otherwise. Mr. Cave will probably give us more precise information than we now have regarding the debt, but the statement to which I have referred admits to a charge of nearly six and a half millions for interest of debt, fixed and floating. Thus, out of a total revenue of ten and a half millions, nearly six and a half go at one blow for interest on debt alone, leaving a little more than four millions for all the expenses of government, municipalities and public works included.

Nevertheless the expenses of government are put down at such moderate sums, that the account is made to balance—

The tribute to Turkey is . . . . .	£668,000
The Khedive's civil list and the allowances to members of his family, so far as can be made out (some of the family allowances are mixed up with the civil departments), about . . . . .	600,000
The whole of the civil departments, provinces regular and irregular, prefectures, municipalities, &c., about £1,100,000, or including extraordinary expenses in Darfour . . . . .	1,300,000
Army . . . . .	700,000
Marine (including a new ship of war), and several other administrations not distinguished in the accounts . . . . .	500,000
Public works . . . . .	368,000
<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>£4,136,000</b>

or a little less than the net income.

If this account were quite correct and exhaustive, we may presume that the Khedive would not be in his present difficulties. We might expect that it must be in some respects too sanguine. But more than this, it is *radically* altered if the occasional correspondent of the *Times*, to whom I have alluded, is correct in a statement he makes regarding a public matter which must be perfectly well known. He says that the £1,575,000 which figures in the accounts of recent years as an extra impost on the land, called "Mokabilah," is the amount raised in pursuance of a decree issued in 1871, by which all landowners who should pay double land-tax for six years were to be freed from half the tax for ever. If this is so, then very shortly the revenue will lose—

Mokabilah . . . . .	£1,575,000
Half of above remitted for ever . . . . .	787,500

£2,362,500

or a good deal more than half the net revenue now available.

It seems very difficult to believe that, if this really were the fact, the Khedive's Government would put forward a statement which would amount to an open confession of utter bankruptcy. We may hope that such patent facts as these, Mr. Cave will at any rate ascertain and report.

Especially interesting and instructive it will be if Mr. Cave can throw real light on what is in truth the crucial question of Egyptian finance, viz. how far the borrowed money has been spent on *bond-fide* reproductive works. The money spent on the Suez Canal was well spent for the human race, if not to the profit of the Khedive; and, if there is any substratum of truth in figures, the present Egyptian railways cannot be a very bad speculation. But whether the great agricultural works, of which so much is said—the irrigation canals and other enterprises—in any degree pay, we do not know. It would certainly be unjust to take credit for revenue really due to these sources, and not to acknowledge that those who lent the money, and those who thus spent it, have acted fairly by the country. It will be, however, very far from an easy task to unravel the accounts, and clear up the question, how much money has been well spent, and how much wasted or plundered. We well know the difficulty from our experience of similar questions in India. To this day, after endless disputations, the official world there is not agreed how far the great works of irrigation pay. If there is so much difficulty in settling this among our own officers in India, it is very clear that to do it in Egypt, in a foreign land, amid the conflict of interested people, will be a task of the utmost difficulty, requiring the special knowledge of experts in these matters, and a great deal of firmness and judgment besides. Whether Mr. Cave's party are equal to the

task remains to be seen. It is very much to be hoped that they will not be led to follow any one-sided representations, but will give us only as much as they can learn surely and clearly. If it should prove that most of the money has really been well spent, we must have much sympathy for the Khedive, even if he has been led by projectors into some expensive mistakes. If most of it has been thrown away, we may well leave him to settle with the amiable gentlemen who advanced the funds.

I have said that the people of Egypt appear to be so well accustomed to a foreign rule that they are not difficult to govern. Though the Turks have long held dominion over Egypt, I understand that they are still to the native Egyptians entirely foreigners; they have not colonised but ruled in Egypt, somewhat as we do in India. The modern Egyptian language and civilisation is Arab, not Turk. The mere fact that the Khedive holds the country with an army which, including his frontier conquests and expeditions, does not figure more largely in his budget, is evidence that the people are quiet and submissive. It is indeed notorious that they have submitted to great hardships in the way of forced labour and other oriental exactions. Every line that one reads, and all that one sees and hears of Egyptian modes and habits, remind one of India.

Although the Egyptians have received an Arabic language and religion, it does not appear that they have taken the Arab character and spirit of independence. They cannot be at all like either the real Arabs whom we know in India as mercenaries, or the half-bred Arabs, the Moplahs, who have given us so much trouble, when excited by agrarian disputes, on the west coast of India. Religion would probably not stand in the way of those who would deal justly by them.

I venture to think that in speaking of Mahommedans we are still sometimes a good deal influenced by religious intolerance. There is a great disposition to seize on anything that can be twisted into Mahommedan "fanaticism." In the old days great things were no doubt accomplished by Arab energy and religious zeal; but among the races converted by political influences the faith does not generally take a fanatical form. In India I am confident that it does not. The Mahommedan empire which preceded us was notoriously tolerant and liberal in the highest degree; and, considering their position as lately dominant, and now placed in many respects at a disadvantage, the bulk of the Indian Mahommedans are marvellously peaceful and good subjects. When the various occasions on which some Mahommedan religious element has been imported into civil or political strife in India are examined, it will generally be found that religion has morely become an incidental bond to supplement an

agitation on political questions. Agrarian disputes have been in fact at the bottom of almost all such cases. Even on the frontier the Pathans are generally the loosest of Mahommedans; the fanatic zeal which troubled us was confined to a very small corner.

It may then, I think, be taken as the practical result of experience, that the mere adoption of the Mahommedan religion by a people not politically unruly does not necessarily make them fanatic and difficult to rule. So long as they have not substantial grievances and there is no interference with their religion, there is nothing to prevent their being good citizens and good subjects. All prejudice apart, one cannot but see that the religion has a very good effect on the conduct and character of the people as compared to any Pagan religion. A respect for the will of God is made more prominent than among many professing Christians, and in the matter of drink and deportment they have considerable advantages over us. They carry the belief in the equality of man into practice as very few Christian peoples do. Even as regards Turkey, one cannot read the reports of our consuls as a whole, setting one against the other and weighing them as an official man is accustomed to weigh such reports, without feeling that the Mahommedans are now almost as much sinned against as sinning. There is very little evidence of popular fanaticism under circumstances which give much occasion for irritation to the dominant race. It is not from fanaticism that the Christians of Turkey (whose position is in some respects curiously like that of Hindoos under Mahommedan rule in India) now suffer, but from the inefficiency and feebleness of the administration, and the financial extravagance begotten by European temptations. The Turks are evidently quite unequal to the very difficult task of governing a country internally divided by race, religion, laws, and manners; and they have got hopelessly into debt. But the ordinary Mahommedan population suffers from these evils just as much as the Christians. In Egypt, I take it that the fact that most of the people are Mahommedans is no insuperable objection to a closer connection with that country on the part of a strong and capable power.

Behind Egypt is Africa. The civilisation and utilisation of Africa is the great enterprise of the future, and it seems pretty clear that the only present available entrance to what may be called "High Africa" is by way of Egypt. In South Africa we come in contact with the Kaffirs, the most warlike and unsettled and least laborious of African races. There is no prospect on that side of a settled and progressive native dominion in Africa to be reached by other than very slow steps. On the west coast our settlements are separated from the interior by difficult and unhealthy jungles. The line of the east coast is held by Portuguese and Zanzibarees, who are not equal to a great enterprise. On the north the Desert separates the outer fringe from the interior.

We know enough to be assured that a strong and civilised power commanding Egypt may open up easy communication with, and navigation of, the great Lake region which occupies the centre of the African continent—a rich country of great capabilities, elevated several thousand feet above the sea, and the possessors of which, if sufficiently strong and organized, would dominate the bulk of the continent. Seeing how admirably fitted for labour the African race have shown themselves to be, how wretched and miserable is their condition in their own country under a barbarous anarchy and bloody slave-dealing customs, and how tractable, amiable, and good-tempered they are under civilised control, one cannot doubt that any great power which could and would perform for Africa the functions which we have performed in India, would immensely benefit the human race. And profitable as has been the labour of Africans in other continents under all the disadvantages of limited numbers, slavery, and a degraded position, it must be that the great native population of Africa would add prodigiously to the resources of the world in their own fertile continent, if, political order being maintained, personal freedom and security were guaranteed to them, and European energy and capital were introduced to direct free labour. The high Lake country in particular appears to be eminently fitted for such a settlement—healthy, fruitful, and fitted both for native and European residence. At the present time some of the most profitable productions in the world are those only produced in the peculiar climate afforded by the combination of a tropical latitude with an elevation which secures against great heat and malaria. Such a climate is insufficiently available elsewhere; in Africa there is a vast extent of it. Already the best coffee comes from High Africa, and pepper, quinine, and many other things would be abundantly produced there. Following the course of the many rivers which radiate from this elevated region, tropical countries of great richness and large populations would be reached as they cannot be reached from the pest-ridden coast. No doubt to any power which can undertake such a work, Africa offers a field greater than India, and one where intervention would be still more justifiable in the interests of humanity. Africa might become a gigantic Java or Ceylon.

The great question, too, whether Africa is to be Christian or Mahommedan, still hangs in the balance. The Mahommedans have very much the start of us; but the traces of old Christianity still linger in Abyssinia, and, without fully accepting Mr. Stanley's account of the extreme religious pliability of his royal friends in Central Africa, we may well believe that, with little tangible religion of their own, the mass of Pagan Africans offer a missionary field such as we have not in India. I have said that I am not at all inclined too much to disparage the Mahommedan religion, and do not doubt that it is far better than Paganism; but once Mahom-



medan never Christian. From a religious point of view we should much wish to see Africa Christian. And there is another view connected with the religious question. The civil law of the Mahommedans is sanctioned by their religion; and as members of society it is this law more than their religion which separates them from people of other faiths and religions. With the religion of the Arabs must come their code of laws—polygamy, and all the rest of it. And this makes a great social gulf between all Mahommedans and Europeans or races deriving their civilisation from European sources.

Moreover, although there was a time when the Arabs were the most energetic and civilised people in the countries on the Mediterranean, it is the fact that all the nations professing Mahommedanism are now more or less effete. Although the Khedive seems to make a fair ruler in his own country, neither financially nor politically is he strong enough to establish a great and well-organised empire in Africa such as ours in India. If he did succeed in acquiring a sort of semi-native dominion, it would be hardly consistent with a full development of European settlement and enterprise. The questions which are now so embarrassing in Egypt would be doubly so in a greater Africa.

It is then only by a first-class European power, or by a combination and agreement of first-class powers, that Africa can be fully reclaimed. Undoubtedly it is very sad if such an advance in the history of the world must be prevented by the want of accord among different powers, the unwillingness of one to allow another to undertake so humanising a work, and other embarrassments. The difficulties of the present situation are very great, and it is to be feared that they will hardly be overcome without some better understanding than now exists.

We come back, then, to the question,—Looking to Egypt as it stands and to African possibilities, is it prudent to let things drift in a direction which may cast on us an Egyptian protectorate? Should we be prepared for such a function if the will of Europe assigned it to us? I think not.

Taking the commercial view first, I cannot think that a mere question of a little higher or lower tariff on the Suez Canal could justify such a step. French and other shareholders, and all who use the Canal, are interested as well as we in keeping open the Canal. There is only question of detail—dredging and repairs, measurements and rates. It could not be worth our while to incur the responsibilities of an Egyptian dominion, and all the difficulties and jealousies which it might entail, for such an object. It would be far better to use the position which we have acquired as a basis to press for some such international arrangement as Lord Derby hints at.

In the political view, looking to our interests in Asia, my opinion is that it would not be worth while to hold Egypt in order to secure the way to India against the remote contingency of a possible temporary interruption. Egypt would be of no use for this purpose unless we at the same time held complete command of the seas on both sides of the Isthmus. If we are to maintain the Canal route in time of war, both for military and commercial purposes, we must not only have fleets superior to any fleets or combination of fleets that can be brought against them, but we must be able to keep up so complete a police of the long narrow seas between Gibraltar and Aden, that our passing ships shall be free from the risk of capture by vessels having the use of ports on the shores of those seas. It has yet to be seen whether, under the present development of steam, it would be possible to secure so long a line of navigation through so great a stretch of narrow sea. If we can really do this, then we shall be free to use the Suez Canal unless Egypt is occupied in great force by a strong military power hostile to us. It is only in the rare event of a combination of the following contingencies that it could be desirable for us to occupy Egypt.

1. War.

2. So effective a command of the seas that our ships can safely pass along the Mediterranean (I use the word in its literal sense) route.

3. The occupation of Egypt by another hostile power while we hold the seas.

We know that on the only occasion on which such circumstances have occurred—when France had occupied Egypt while we held the seas—the Great Napoleon was unable to maintain that occupation. In all probability it would be so again. It might be better to trust to our ability to secure Egypt when the necessity arises, than to forestall the necessity by undertaking an onerous charge in anticipation of a need which may not arise for generations.

After all, too, it is not a matter of life and death to us to maintain the Canal route under all possible circumstances. Suppose that, by a concurrence of events, it is some day or other (some distant day we may hope) interrupted for a time? Well, the Canal is not the only way to India. Till the other day we very well maintained our commercial and military communications by another route—to a great extent we do so still. It is only a question of a voyage longer by a month or six weeks.

If the position was reversed, if there were on the Asiatic side of the Canal some first-class power which might find an opportunity of trapping our fleet on that side, and which, holding the seas on this side for ever so short a time, might descend on our British shores, alone or with others, and strike a fatal blow at our very

heart, it might in that case be worth while to make any sacrifice to secure ourselves against the remotest possibility of such an event. But our position in India is far different. There we do not, with a petty army, depend for our existence on the command of the seas. In India we are nothing if not military. We have now great facilities of transport in India, great material and resources in the country itself. I should be very sorry indeed to suppose that we could not maintain ourselves there, even for a few months, against any force that could suddenly be sent against us, without aid from this country. When our European force was at the weakest, and our danger the greatest, we fought and won the battle of the Mutiny before effective aid from England arrived on the scene. It was not till Delhi was taken, and our eventual triumph secure, that the regiments from England came into the field to make it more rapid and complete. We should have done very well, even if troops could not then have been sent through Egypt.

If a Russian invasion be possible, it is certain that the Russian route to India is far slower than that in steamers round the Cape. No other power could send by sea, through the Suez Canal, a force which could do more than harass our coasts. It is impossible that an army, with the carriage and material necessary to cope with the means which we could bring to bear on a threatened quarter, could be sent by so long a sea voyage. I hope that we continue to establish ourselves more firmly against internal dangers. India is not worth holding if our position is not so strong that we could maintain ourselves, for a little time at any rate, against dangers external and internal without aid from England. If the delay caused by the necessity of sending the troops which we could spare from England (and how many would they be?) round the Cape on some rare occasion might be fatal, the sooner we abandon so insecure a position the better.

From an Indian point of view, then, I do not see an adequate motive for undertaking or accepting the control of Egypt. If we assume such a function, it must be because the position is in itself a desirable one.

I have said that if Egypt were not embarrassed by debt the country would pay well, and that the character and religion of the people would probably present no great obstacle to civilised control; but in fact Egypt is embarrassed by debt, with which we should find it very difficult to deal; and though it might be as easily governed as an Indian province, it would be but one Indian province the more, and that one isolated and exposed to European complications and dangers such as we do not feel in India. Although the Turks are foreigners in Egypt, the family of the Khedive has so identified itself with the country, and they are so much taking the position of

native rulers, that there would be no ground for dispossessing them any more than the best of our Indian feudatory princes. We could but assume a protectorate and suzerainty. Even the tribute which Turkey now receives as the recompense for those functions has been pledged by the Sultan to his creditors, and it would not be easy for us to get it. We should hold the position which we do towards a native State in India, which we have undertaken to protect while we do not touch the revenue. Altogether, with our enormous responsibilities for the rule or protection of 240 millions of people in India, there seems to be no call on us to undertake a few more millions in Egypt. Egypt alone is not a dominion which it would be for our advantage to undertake, or which any call of duty imposes on us.

It would only be with a view to Africa that we could think of undertaking Egypt. No doubt for the gigantic task of governing and civilising Africa we have some special facilities which no other country possesses. We have the capital, the energies, and the habitudes, by means of which we have been accustomed to occupy and improve new countries. We have learned in India the art of governing great subject populations. We have in India the materials for a native army which we might raise almost to any numbers, which, with our present experience of the northern races, we may make almost as efficient as European troops (for African purposes probably more so), and which we might employ abroad without those dangers which are inevitable to a too large and efficient native army serving in India. If we should conclude that it is right to promote emigration on a large scale from the densely populated parts of India, and should succeed in doing so, probably no field would be better than Africa, where anarchy and bloodshed have left room for much new population, and where Indian intelligence and Indian arts might do much to supplement the honest hard work of the Negro.

There is much to tempt us to such an undertaking. If the time were approaching when our work in India would be completed, when, having done our duty in that country and raised the natives to a high level, it would be better for all parties that we should leave them to govern themselves, then indeed, in view of such eventualities, it might be well that we should make a beginning of an African dominion, and look to the day when a British-African Empire might succeed our British-Indian Empire, just as in the last century the British-Indian Empire succeeded that American empire which we were compelled to abandon. But there is not yet in India any such prospect of independence and self-government. The question whither our rule in that country is tending becomes more puzzling every day; certainly we do not yet see our way to any

definite plans by which it may reach a safe self-governing position. We could not relieve ourselves of our task there even if we would, and at present, at any rate, we would not. With India on our hands, I think we could not undertake Africa. It is dangerous for a small country to undertake too much. Already we feel a strain on our population—there are other outlets to it than our own dominions and our own colonies. We could hardly undertake Africa from Indian resources alone. Capital we have in England in abundance, but a too great extension of our power might weaken the heart.

If a real working federation of English-speaking nations were possible, great things might be attempted; but at present there is no approach to any such system. The great English-speaking colonies are entirely freed from the control of the Imperial Parliament; they govern themselves as they please in all things, and only retain the right to claim our protection while it is convenient to them to do so. We can in no shape tax Canada for any Imperial object. The Australians would much like to annex New Guinea, but even that they would have us do at our expense, not theirs. Certainly we could not draw on Canada or Australia for a great African enterprise. Still better would it be if we could have a federation of European nations, or nations of European origin, and on the part of such a federation undertake the reclamation of the barbarous parts of the old world, both in Africa and in Asia; but we have not yet any immediate prospect of a union of Christian countries now armed against one another.

With our great possessions and great undertakings both of government and colonisation, we might well, without jealousy, let any other nation really capable of it undertake a great work in Africa, if we could have sufficient guarantees for our communications and just rights; but in truth, if we cannot undertake the reclamation of Africa, still less is any other country in a position to do so. It must have become evident to France that, with her present social arrangements and the want of increment in her population, she is not a colonising country as she was in the last century. She has failed to colonise Algiers, and would, under her present circumstances, hardly seek a greater Africa. Germany has enough to do at home—Russia far more than enough. Italy is perhaps the country best fitted for an African undertaking, if her internal state were sufficiently secured and her financial position good; but that is not yet.

On the whole, I think it comes to that to which I have already pointed; viz., that the best use we can make of the interest which we have acquired in the Suez Canal, is to make it the basis for actively promoting the plan at which Lord Derby has hinted—the

control of the enterprise by some sort of international commission on the part of the powers chiefly interested. We are now in a position to promote such an arrangement, not only without creating jealousies, but by way of allaying jealousies, since it would imply the abandonment of exclusive interests and control on our part. Such an arrangement made, we could dispose of our shares to private holders, bringing them into the English market as much as possible, not in order to create a preponderating English influence, but only to render the proprietary not exclusively foreign.

There remains the real difficulty—the loan to the Khedive—the interest due from him for nineteen years to come. Whatever happens, we must always remember the maxim not to throw good money after bad ; and especially we must be of all things careful not to allow a comparatively small pecuniary stake to involve us in a line of policy which we would not otherwise adopt. Unless our interest is secured by some guarantee of which we yet know nothing, our moderate 5 per cent. will be no better placed than the exorbitant return for which private financiers have stipulated. If one is not paid, neither will be the other. Mr. Cave's mission is a fact. We may hope that it will really throw some light on the Egyptian finances—a light which will probably be made available to all the world ; but beyond the information thus gained once for all, we should, I think, scrupulously avoid any further *official* interference with the Khedive's financial management. We cannot so interfere without making ourselves in some sort responsible, and creating financial hopes and expectations, compared to which our own £200,000 per annum is a small sum. Of course the Khedive may avail himself of private English aid, as he may of aid from any other source. It is the official interference of the English Government which is to be eschewed. If, with such aid and advice as he can obtain, the Khedive can maintain his credit and pay his creditors, ourselves among the number, good and well ; if he fails, we must submit to the loss with others, and put it down to the policy of rescuing the Suez Canal from a foreign monopoly which the Government has adopted.

There is still the old question—If the Turkish Empire breaks up, who is to take its place in regard to Egypt ? I suppose there is nothing for it but to await the event. If an international control and regulation of the Canal can be established, a step will be gained, a precedent and example furnished, for some international arrangement by which Egypt may be controlled and the affairs of Central Africa regulated.

{GEORGE CAMPBELL.

## WHAT ARE LIBERAL PRINCIPLES?

TWENTY years ago a strange panic seized upon the public mind in this country, and for a while shook the national faith in representative institutions. A temporary failure of our commissariat at the commencement of the Crimean war, contrasted with the supposed efficiency of French military administration, sufficed to produce a passionate impatience of parliamentary control, and a craving for "strong," if not for "personal," government. Even the Prince Consort, speaking deliberately at a critical juncture, declared that constitutional government was "under a heavy trial;" and less prudent men, with less knowledge of English history, were neither afraid nor ashamed to enlarge significantly on the merits of a dictatorship. This fit of unworthy self-abasement rapidly passed away; the vigour of English organization was seen to increase as the shortcomings of French organization became more evident with every month of the war; the French people soon afterwards began to clamour for those very liberties which Englishmen had affected to despise; Italy, Germany, and Austria herself, successively adopted constitutional government of an English type; the great struggle of 1870 showed that, for want of it, the armaments of France had no moral force behind them, and the idol of French Imperialism was finally shattered at Sedan. Thenceforward we have seldom heard of personal government, except for the purpose of pointing an adverse moral; and, in 1876, few would venture to whisper in the secret chambers those anti-constitutional sympathies which, in 1855, were freely proclaimed upon the housetops.

A similar wave of reactionary sentiment has, nevertheless, recently passed over the surface of English politics. As the vitality of the British Constitution was impugned because the arrangements for supplying the British army had broken down in a sudden emergency, so the vitality of Liberal Principles is impugned because a Conservative Ministry has existed for two years and there is no immediate prospect of displacing it. For twenty-five years before, with three very short intervals, the Liberal Party had been in power; during this period it had triumphantly carried nearly all the measures which Liberals of the last generation had at heart; having sunk into a minority under a combination of influences that would have destroyed any other party much earlier, it has still been able to hold the ground which it had conquered; and yet there are those who profess not only to despair of its revival, but to doubt the very

existence of distinctive Liberal Principles. In vain are they reminded that patriots of former ages were content to live and content to die for principles of civil and religious liberty, which are now the inheritance of the Liberal party, but which then, as now, were a stumbling-block to faint-hearted believers and foolishness to political sceptics. In vain are they invited to watch the growing ascendancy of Liberal Principles on the Continent, after repeated discouragements, and under far more arduous conditions. They admit that in its origin the Liberal cause was the cause of the people, that it was a reality, and not a mere name, in the days of Hampden and the days of Somers, under the ill-disguised autocracy of George III. and in the great reaction which followed the French Revolution. They do not deny that momentous issues were at stake when that reaction was rudely cut short by the first Reform Act, and they are fain to acknowledge that Liberal Principles were not wholly played out when their energy was suspended during the declining years of Lord Palmerston. They cannot help perceiving that Germany has become the first Power of Europe, and that Italy has made herself a great nation, by tardily embracing the most essential of Liberal Principles; they recognise Liberal Principles as the basis of national prosperity in Switzerland, in Holland, and in Belgium; they applaud the adoption of Liberal Principles and condemn every backsliding from Liberal Principles in France; they know that Liberal Principles created the United States of America, and are the very breath of life to all the more prosperous British colonies. They would be Liberals anywhere but at home, and in any age but the present. The alleged exhaustion of Liberal Principles is peculiar, forsooth, to Great Britain, and it is from the last general election that we are complacently admonished to date the new millennium of political indifference.

But the reign of political indifference is sometimes proclaimed, not so much on the ground that Liberal Principles are exhausted, as on the ground that all their stable and valuable elements have been absorbed into modern Conservatism, or at least have become the common property of both parties. How far this is from being true will hereafter appear more clearly. In the meantime, we cannot fail to remark that, if true, it would amount to a most triumphant justification of Liberal Principles, and an almost conclusive presumption against abandoning our hold upon them. If Liberal Principles are shown to have guided the nation aright in the seventeenth century, in the eighteenth century, and during the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century; if those who persistently opposed Liberal Principles for so many generations are now convicted of having opposed reason and justice and national interest—surely this is a strange reason for abjuring Liberal Principles under their own proper title,



and fastening upon them an alien title like "Conservative" or "Constitutional," hitherto associated with resistance to Liberal Principles. If the Party which Mr. Disraeli more accurately calls "Tory" is really prepared to burn what it used to adore and adore what it used to burn, why should they cling so fondly to party watchwords and appellations which recall the shameful memories of English constitutional history, instead of borrowing the name with the glorious traditions of the Liberal Party?

But it is really difficult to discuss with a grave face the hypothesis of Liberal Principles having been recently merged in the nebulous mass of "Conservative Principles." For where, let us ask, are these Conservative Principles, and who shall either find the centre or describe the circumference of their orbit? Assuredly, Conservative Principles, if they ever existed at all, have long since been invisible to the naked eye, and the want of them is not supplied either by a community of party instincts or by the good sense and honesty of individuals. Church-and-King Toryism was at least positive, but the Conservatism now in vogue is not merely a system of negations, it is a system of negations which is constantly fluctuating with the subtraction of old and the addition of new tenets, as political expediency may require. If ever the modern Conservative Party had a fixed conviction, this conviction was that it was their mission to stem the flood of democracy; and even when Mr. Disraeli had educated them into perceiving that it would be a shrewder game to manipulate the democratic movement, and outbid their opponents, three Cabinet Ministers felt it their duty to resign, and more than one of those who retained office solemnly pledged himself never to accept household suffrage without certain definite safeguards. Within a few weeks these safeguards were thrown overboard, and these pledges broken without so much as a blush; the scruples of the weaker brethren who had seceded from the Government had become a subject of pity rather than of respect in Conservative society; and the Prime Minister, enjoying the unbounded confidence of his Party, openly boasted of having taken a leap in the dark—a leap which might imperil the British Constitution, indeed, but which could not fail to "dish the Whigs." It was no Radical enemy, but a familiar friend of the Conservative party, who, still writhing under the humiliation of 1867, described its creed as a marvellous compound of political bigotry and political infidelity. At all events, after this signal exhibition of Conservative morality, only to be matched by the conduct of the same Party on the Conspiracy Bill of 1858, it would be idle to seek anything like a Principle in the negative professions of Conservatism, while the subtlest analysis will equally fail to detect anything like a Principle in its affirmative manifestoes. The Queen's Speeches of 1874 and 1875, the

parliamentary and extra-parliamentary utterances of Conservative members, and the election addresses of candidates, may alike be ransacked without discovering a maxim by which modern Conservative statesmanship would be willing to stand or fall, unless it be the maxim of government by the landed aristocracy. *Government by the landed aristocracy* appears, in fact, to have become the one cardinal article of the Conservative faith, as it is manifestly the idea which determined the personal composition of Mr. Disraeli's Cabinet. What the landed aristocracy may do with their power, is apparently a secondary consideration in the eyes of Conservative politicians, and we have no reason to suppose that any assurances which they may now give us of hostility to household suffrage in the counties, or even of fidelity to Church and State, will be held more sacred than their repeated vows never to support a degradation of the franchise in boroughs. True, it is almost impossible to imagine the Church Establishment being deserted by the Conservative Party so long as the present system of Church patronage is upheld, but it is very easy to imagine a profound alteration in the sentiments of Conservative squires towards clergymen, if clergymen were in any sense representatives of the parishioners, or even nominees of bishops. Those who could indorse the semi-communistic programme of the New Social Alliance, or who see nothing unconstitutional in Female Suffrage, are not men to stick at political trifles, and irksome traditions of old-fashioned Toryism will be cast off as lightly as the Slave Circular was retracted, or the farmers rebuked for continuing to agitate against the malt-tax. It is, indeed, this very incapacity of seeing the difference between Principles and expedients, between wise measures and skilful manœuvres, which makes a Conservative administration so dangerous, and justifies the hopes which the promoters of revolutionary crotchets repose in its unlimited pliability.

What, then, are Liberal Principles? This is the question which Lord Derby avowed himself unable to answer in that remarkable exposition of Conservative policy at Edinburgh, which must have sounded to working men like a gospel of political despair. In approaching such an inquiry, it may not be amiss to bear in mind a striking parallel furnished by the religious world. No divisions among English Liberals are so broad, or so deep, or so ancient, or so enduring, as those which keep asunder the various Protestant churches of Europe and America. Moreover, the divisions of Protestantism are rendered more significant by contrast with the imposing unity of Catholicism—an unity which, hollow as it is, far transcends in solidity any superficial coherence of the Conservative party. Nevertheless, we may well ask whether the most sectarian of Protestants, or the most unscrupulous of Jesuits, would dispute the existence of governing ideas and definite tendencies common

to all Protestantism, and opposing an insuperable barrier to any reunion of Christendom on a Catholic basis. If this be true—and who can deny it?—there may surely be governing ideas and definite tendencies common to English Liberalism, in spite of all the differences between the centre and left wing of the Party. In other words, there may be a profound agreement on Liberal Principles underlying, in the deeper strata of thought, all the manifold disagreements on Liberal policy. To enumerate these Principles exhaustively would of course be impossible, but it is not impossible to identify some of those which are most firmly implanted in the heads and hearts of true Liberals, and the influence of which is most clearly to be traced in recent history.

## II.

The first and broadest of all Liberal Principles is the unreserved recognition of Progress as the appointed law of all human institutions, civil or religious. This Principle, sometimes ridiculed as a truism by modern Conservatives, has been steadily violated or ignored in Conservative policy, and is practically embraced, with all its consequences, by Liberals alone. Looking upon the nation as a living and growing organism, a true Liberal watches, not merely without alarm but with hearty satisfaction, those results of national life and growth which call for constant readjustments of political and administrative machinery. He does not fall into the Conservative error of imagining that codes or precedents or customs or forms have any vitality or any authority in themselves, but he regards them as products of national character, the development of which should keep pace, and should not more than keep pace, with the natural process of social evolution. Acting on this Principle, the Liberal Party carried the great Reform Act of 1832, whereby the representation of petty boroughs was transferred to populous towns, and the mass of the middle classes admitted within the pale of the Constitution. Acting on this Principle, the same Party welcomed the rise of the artisan class in boroughs; and though defeated in the attempt to enfranchise the best part of them, compelled its opponents to pass a still larger extension of the suffrage, throwing out the provisions under which it was sought to take back with one hand what had been given with the other. It was this Principle which, applied to urban self-government, produced the reform of Municipal Corporations; and this which, applied to endowments, produced the Charity Commission, the University Reform Acts, and the Endowed Schools Act, with many like measures designed to protect the interests of the living against the posthumous control of the dead. It was this Principle again, which, having been adopted

too late to save the American colonies, has since been carried out by the Liberal Party in extending to most of our other colonies the privileges and obligations of free communities. But it is superfluous to multiply examples of its operation, for not a year or a month elapses without bringing up some issue on which the Liberal Party advocates progress, and the Conservative Party places itself in the attitude of obstruction. Not that every Liberal possesses, or that every Conservative lacks, the power of discerning the signs of an institution having outgrown its original structure, and the mode in which it should be adapted to new conditions. Such insight and flexibility of mind are given, in fact, to few, and fewer still retain the courage to exercise them in advanced life. But since the Liberal seers have ever been first to indicate the necessity of progressive changes, and since the Liberal Party has generally had the wisdom to follow their guidance, an active belief in Progress may justly be claimed as an essentially and distinctively Liberal Principle.

2. A second Principle, implied in the very word "Liberal," and illustrated in every chapter of Liberal policy, is an imperishable love of Freedom. Long before the Liberal Party had grasped the idea of progress, or divined the "increasing purpose" which runs through all the ages, the idea of freedom, both civil and religious, had become the very life-blood of the Liberal creed, and borne ample fruit in legislation. Animated by this Principle, as applied to colonial policy, even the oligarchical Whiggism of Burke and his associates rose into a lofty Republican strain, in protesting against the arbitrary measures which produced the American war. The freedom of the press was not achieved without a struggle prolonged from the age of Milton to a period within living memory, in which all the Conservative forces were arrayed against it, and Liberals asserted it under peril of imprisonment. Personal freedom was only secured to all British subjects by the most determined efforts of Liberals, after the Reform Act had weakened the power of the slave-owning interest and their Conservative allies. For, though Conservatives shared with Liberals the honour of abolishing the slave trade, the horrors of which shocked their humanity, very few but Liberals were found to reprobate slavery, as slavery; and it was but yesterday that Liberal opinion arrested a Conservative Government in the act of countenancing slavery by an order of the Admiralty. Freedom of worship, as well as freedom of election to municipal offices, were denied to Protestant Nonconformists, while other privileges of citizenship were denied to Roman Catholics, until both were emancipated by the irresistible pressure which the Liberal party brought to bear even on Conservative ministers. Freedom of trade was carried by means of Liberal agitation, so ably and persistently conducted as to convert another Conservative minister, who speedily

paid the price of his patriotism in expulsion from office, and who has never been forgiven by that Party which had originally imposed the Corn Laws and so long idolized the principle of Protection. Freedom of labour cannot be said to have existed in England until the restrictions imposed on the independence of labourers by the Poor Laws and Combination Laws were removed by a series of Liberal measures, culminating in the Union Chargeability Act, so bitterly opposed by the Conservatives, and the Trade Union Acts of 1871, which the present Home Secretary has extended in accordance with the proposals of Mr. Lowe. Freedom of education—in the sense of free participation in State grants and public endowments—is not even yet fully assured to all creeds in this country; but it is the Liberal Party, and the Liberal Party alone, which, step by step, has succeeded in banishing tests from elementary schools, from the universities, and from many, though not from all, of the endowed schools. Freedom of voting has always been a Liberal watchword, as the use of “legitimate influence” has been always justified by Conservatives; and, though many Liberals prized open voting even more than free voting, a majority of the Party adopted the secret ballot as the one effectual remedy against coercion and intimidation. Nor can we omit to notice the intuitive sympathy with freedom of thought which in all ages has been characteristic of political reformers. Men who have been used to let their minds play freely round the fundamental questions of politics, and men who have been used to speculate freely on the fundamental questions of religion or philosophy, cannot but feel a mutual respect and affinity. Herein lies the secret of that natural alliance between Liberalism and science, which is so mysterious to Conservatives, but which permanently enlists the most powerful intellects in the nation on the Liberal side.

It will be observed that, in all these cases, the Principle vindicated is that of individual liberty, so far, and so far only, as it is consistent with the paramount rights and duties of society. It is not Liberalism which benevolently allows each man to endanger his neighbour's health by keeping up some favourite nuisance, or to sell his neighbour adulterated goods with impunity; still less is the so-called doctrine of *laissez faire* to be reckoned among Liberal principles. From a Liberal point of view, indeed, to claim infallibility for the State is almost as absurd as to claim infallibility for the Church, and this is an additional reason for leaving both individual citizens and local communities to govern themselves as far as possible. But, after all, the State, unlike the Church, is itself in this country the highest expression of self-government, and must needs lay down rules for the mutual relations both of local communities and of individual citizens. Liberals do not hold that either local communities or

individual citizens have an abstract right to manage their own affairs, or that where the interests of others are involved with their own, they can be trusted safely to do so. Such notions are more in harmony with the French theory of Individualism and the American theory of State-right than with the historical growth of civil liberty in England, concurrently with an ever-widening supremacy of law over custom and of the nation over local government. What Liberals do hold is, simply, that in general people will manage their own affairs best, and may be trusted safely to do so where the interests of others are not involved, but that where the State finds it necessary to interfere for the common good of all, it should in general interfere by compulsory rather than by permissive legislation.

It is probably this last opinion to which Lord Derby alludes, when he speaks of a strong inclination towards "democratic despotism" as a very marked feature of "the new Radical creed." Now, it may be remarked in passing, that "democratic despotism" would at least have this advantage over monarchical or oligarchical despotism—that a majority of the people would be more likely to understand and study the real welfare of the whole than a small minority or a minority of one. Still, even "democratic despotism" is treason against political liberty, and Lord Derby's warning on this subject is not altogether unseasonable. No doubt a disposition has lately manifested itself to rebel against the sound but unsentimental rules of political economy, and to seek for social improvement by the shorter method of State intervention. The usual excuse for such intervention is that long arrears of legislation must needs be made up without delay, and that it is but equity for Government to redress in one age evils which Government may have fostered in another age. The distinction between acts which affect the individual only and those which affect his fellows also is forgotten or ignored. Because compulsory vaccination may be justified as a necessary safeguard of public health, and compulsory education as a means of rescuing neglected children from vice and crime, it is assumed that some good and no harm can result from a compulsory regulation of agricultural contracts or of ship-building. Protectionist fallacies of this kind may or may not form part of some "new Radical creed" known to Lord Derby, as they assuredly form part of the delusive visions held out by less scrupulous Conservatives than Lord Derby to credulous working men. But they are flagrantly at variance with Liberal Principles, and have been steadily discouraged, at no light sacrifice of popularity, by the responsible leaders of the Liberal Party.

3. Next among the distinctive Principles of Liberalism must be placed the pregnant, but thoroughly constitutional, idea of Equality

—not of social but of civil equality—of that equality before the law to which all the subjects of a British Sovereign have as good a right as all the citizens of a Greek Republic. Liberals know as well as Conservatives that men are not born equal in ability, in virtue, or in the prospects of fortune which depend on parentage. What they fail to understand is, why these startling contrasts between the original lot of Dives and of Lazarus should be aggravated, rather than mitigated, by the effect of human laws. They are fully aware that, in a country like our own, where feudal traditions are still potent, and where the ambition of founding a family is the besetting weakness of every *parvenu*, the custom of primogeniture, unless directly forbidden by law, is likely to prevail for many generations. But they do not see either the justice or the expediency of consecrating this custom by legislative enactment—of prescribing, in the case of descent on intestacy, and of favouring, in the case of family settlements, the practice of accumulating all landed property upon the eldest son. They acknowledge that in filling the higher posts of the civil, naval, and military service, a large discretion must be left to patronage, and therefore a wide door opened to nepotism and jobbery; they perceive, also, that no precaution can deprive rich men's sons of the lion's share in the distribution of clerkships by literary competition. But these considerations do not lead them to regard a reckless distribution of great offices with any satisfaction, or to neglect the only measures through which promotion by merit can be effectually substituted for the caste system in the army, navy, and civil departments. On the contrary, the Liberal Party, with the aid of one or two enlightened Conservatives, has at length succeeded in establishing competitive examinations as the one avenue to inferior posts in the Civil Service; while the same Party, opposed by the whole Conservative force, carried the abolition of purchase in the army, and vainly strove to defeat the reactionary designs embodied in the Army Exchange Bill and the new regulations for the appointment of naval cadets. Liberals, again, are perfectly conscious that, however complete may be the legal equality of electors, the practical influence of education, of property, and of mere notoriety will make one voter's support worth a hundred or a thousand times as much as that of another. But this does not prevent their regarding all their fellow-citizens as "their own flesh and blood," or reconcile them to a carefully packed representation of "interests," or cause them to favour schemes for enabling the few to outvote the many. They appreciate the prodigious advantage which the Church of England possesses by virtue of its history, its corporate revenues, the perfection of its organization, and the learning of its clergy, over and above that which it derives from its connection with the State. But this did not seem to

them a good reason for extending to Church affairs the maxim, "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away;" they protested loudly against the exaction of Church-rates from Nonconformists, as well as against the exclusion of Nonconformists from educational endowments, and they now protest against the prohibition of Nonconformist services in parochial churchyards.

These are a few typical specimens of the mode in which the Liberal Principle of civil Equality has been applied by the Liberal Party, not in levelling down, but in levelling up, not in weakening the strong, but in strengthening the weak, not in destroying the power of natural superiority, but in breaking down the artificial barriers raised between man and man by Privilege, Monopoly, and Ascendancy. If this be Democracy, then Liberal Principles are democratic, and it is for those who repudiate Democracy, in this sense, to uphold that of which it is the opposite.

4. Closely allied to a belief in civil Liberty and a belief in civil Equality, is a fourth Liberal Principle which is difficult to describe in a single word or phrase, but which is deeply rooted in every Liberal mind. This principle is an immutable respect for human nature as such, not merely because Christianity invests every human being with the majesty of immortality, but also because experience has shown that every race and every type of mankind is endowed with noble qualities and capable of almost infinite elevation. It was this respect for human nature and human destiny which leagued itself with the idea of liberty to crush slavery. It was this which annulled the Draconian code, assigning death as the penalty of two hundred and thirty-eight offences; teaching men that even criminals have claims on society, and that if repression is the primary, reformation is the secondary object of punishment. It is this which inspires Liberals with a manly aversion to the punishment of the lash, the use of the branding-iron, and the infliction of any needless personal indignity even on the outcasts of society. It is this which has enlisted so many Liberals on the side of Labour in its struggle for independence, and which is ever on the watch against the judicial oppression which is still occasionally practised at petty sessions. It is this which has gradually introduced humanity into our relations with savage tribes, and forbearance into our relations with subject populations, which has saved the Maories of New Zealand from extermination, and which sternly condemned the atrocities perpetrated under the rule of martial law in Jamaica.

The love of Peace, which has so nobly characterized the Liberal party since the age of Fox, sometimes curbing the aggressive impulses of British commerce in Asia, and often restraining us from disastrous intervention in Europe or America, has its main origin in a



cognate Principle. If Liberals alone refuse to regard war as a permanent institution, and are ever seeking to diminish its causes, it is not because they prefer material prosperity to national greatness; it is because they have a worthy conception of national greatness, because their feelings towards foreign peoples are feelings of friendship rather than of enmity, and, above all, because they can sympathize with the suffering and toiling masses who have everything to lose and nothing to gain by military glory. From a like source there springs that generous confidence in popular intelligence and sense of right which convinced Liberals that, in spite of Conservative maledictions, the Republican bubble had not burst in America, and that no United States Government supported by the American people would ever be guilty of repudiation; which has always actuated Liberals in dealing with the parliamentary and municipal franchise, and which fortified Liberals against the Conservative fear of a cheap newspaper press. And as Liberals believe in public virtue and national conscience and international morality, so they believe in the honest and independent exercise of human reason. Upon this belief reposes the sturdy Protestantism of which Liberalism is the political counterpart, which thinks nobly of the human soul, and which holds, in opposition to Romanism, that on the open field of inquiry truth, and not error, must in the end prevail. This is why Liberals are plausibly accused of optimism, and occasionally lend too ready an ear to schemes of world-bettering. Looking upon what men have done as "the earnest of what they yet may do," knowing that by the efforts of human intellect civilisation has been evolved from barbarism, sanguine Liberals may be tempted, indeed, to expect too much from similar efforts organized under scientific guidance, but their hopefulness is in itself a motive power of untold value, and their enthusiasm wiser than all the cynical sagacity of Conservative pessimism.

5. It may well appear somewhat pharisaical to class an habitual regard for political justice among distinctive Liberal Principles, and it would indeed be absurd if the Liberal party should arrogate to itself the sole possession of this sentiment. Nevertheless, facts go far to prove that Justice is a governing idea of Liberal policy in a sense which is not merely foreign to Conservative policy, but which Conservative politicians have often laughed to scorn. All the Reform Bills supported by the Liberal party, including two Irish bills introduced by Mr. Butt last session, have been advocated mainly on grounds of political justice, and opposed by the Conservative Party on grounds of naked expediency. The Irish Church Act was essentially based on considerations of justice and not of selfish utility, for it was foreseen that it would fail to conciliate Irish Catholics and would provoke bitter resentment among Irish Pro-

testants. The Washington Treaty, with the expression of national regret which it embodied for the first time in diplomatic history, was entirely dictated by the sentiment of justice. Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet was not weak enough to suppose that so high-spirited a people as the British people would relish a virtual acknowledgment of having been in the wrong; but they were convinced that in the single case of the *Alabama* we had been in the wrong, and they had the manliness to make the *amende honorable* on behalf of their countrymen. It would be easy to cite other unpopular acts of Liberal Governments, for which no other motive than a sentiment of justice can be imagined, and into which no Conservative tactician like Mr. Disraeli would ever have been thus betrayed. On the other hand, it would not be difficult to cite unjust acts of Conservative Governments—such as the suppression of the Heligoland Constitution—for which no particular motive can be imagined, but of which no Liberal minister could have been guilty. But perhaps the most suggestive example of the difference between the Conservative and the Liberal standard of political justice is to be found in the much greater fairness of Liberal warfare in opposition. It has been said that Mr. Gladstone's Administration was "lied out of office;" and though such a statement may be too unqualified, it is certain that no resource of factious intrigue or calumnious mendacity was left untried by the Conservative Party. Instead of retaliating, the ex-ministers in the House of Commons, under Lord Hartington's leadership, have frequently befriended Mr. Disraeli's Government in their parliamentary difficulties, have commented with great moderation on their official blunders, and have sometimes carried forbearance to excess where abuses of patronage ought to have been exposed. After duly considering this, let any impartial man compare the present courteous tone of the Liberal press with the unscrupulous language employed by the Conservative press during the last Parliament, and he will be driven to conclude that fair play in political controversy is a distinctive Liberal Principle.

6. One more Liberal Principle remains to be mentioned, which of late years has become the most distinctive of all—the deliberate preference of national interests over all minor interests, whether of classes, of sects, of professions, or of individuals. At first sight this Principle, like the last, so closely resembles an elementary precept of public morality, that we may hesitate to treat it as characteristic of one Party rather than another. Unhappily, experience has shown that no Principle is more at variance with the spirit of Conservative policy, as there is none which promises less ephemeral popularity to any Party which honestly observes it. In old times, a corrupt expenditure of a few thousand pounds would buy the support of a powerful family or a parliamentary seat of priceless value to a

ministry, without appreciably injuring the pocket or the feelings of a single voter, and not the smallest particle of national gratitude was to be earned by abstaining from it. So, in these days, it is far more profitable to propitiate a class at the expense of the nation, than it is to serve the nation at the expense of a class. The apostles of Free Trade were fortunate enough to array the interests of one class against those of another, and for once to persuade the people that all of them would gain, as consumers, by cheapening imports, while only a section of them were gaining, as producers, by Protection. It is seldom, however, that a political lesson can be so closely brought home, and the fate of the last Ministry suffices to show at what a cost the Liberal Principle of subordinating particular to national interests must generally be maintained. In dealing with the Irish Church and the Irish land, in reforming the licensing system, in abolishing army purchase, in regulating educational endowments, in remodelling the judicature, in reducing their own patronage, in enforcing economy in all branches of the public service, and still more in the general tenor of their whole administrative policy, Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues were guilty of sheer Quixotry in the eyes of Conservatives; for they had actually offended or alarmed the clergy of the Established Church, the landlords, the brewers and publicans, the officers of the army, the local trustees of schools, the lawyers, the clerks in public offices, and the waiters upon Providence, without benefiting any one—except the nation. We have since had an excellent illustration of policy based on the opposite Principle. By relieving English publicans from some of the restrictions on disorder and drunkenness, by talking out the Irish Sunday Closing Bill, by legalizing bargains for regimental exchanges, by restoring the nomination system for naval cadetships, by revising the Adulteration Act, by mutilating the Judicature Act, and by suppressing the Endowed Schools Commission as an independent body, Mr. Disraeli and his colleagues have appeased more or less fully most of the classes “harassed” by their predecessors; and all this, too, without injuring any one—except the nation.

The preference of popular to proprietary rights, where they come into collision, is but a corollary of the same Principle. In the eyes of a Liberal, it is more important that Birmingham should be drained than it is that neighbouring landowners should escape any annoyance; towns and villages below twenty-five thousand inhabitants ought not to be excluded from the Artizans’ Dwellings Bill to please the country gentlemen; nor should the Agricultural Children’s Act be made a dead letter to save the pockets of farmers. Cattle-owners ought not to be compensated twice over for losses by the Rinderpest at the expense of consumers; poor commoners have quite as sacred privileges as lords of manors; and the revenues of the London com-

panies are not to be left at the private disposition of their members present and future. It was not Liberal members of Parliament that cheered the insolent self-laudation of a shipowner who had compromised the neutrality of England for the sake of commercial profit. It was not a Liberal Government that contrived to undo the beneficent legislation of 1844, and relieve the owners of noxious manufactories in London from the statutable obligation to remove them in the year 1874; nor was it a Liberal Government that showed the cloven foot of favouritism on the question of savings-bank accounts. Nay, more—it was once a Liberal paradox that property has its duties as well as its rights; and it is still a Liberal paradox that proprietary rights, like all other rights, were created by law for the benefit, not of individuals, but of the entire community.

But this distinction between Liberal and Conservative ideas is more clearly marked in everyday administration than it is in legislation, and in those details of administration which are not seen than it is in those which are seen. It sometimes appears as if Conservatives lacked the very belief in the efficacy of administrative public spirit. When a Conservative Government comes into office, there is not a public servant, civil or military—from the admiral or general to the humblest sailor or private, and from the heads of departments to the lowest clerk or messenger—who does not receive the impression that strict vigilance is no longer the order of the day, that national requirements are no longer to domineer over private claims, that England no longer expects every man to do his duty, but only hopes that he will do so. The effect of this impression is not felt at once. For a while it appears that it is possible for a Government to scatter and yet to increase, to serve its friends and the nation with equal fidelity, to reap efficiency without sowing purity and economy. But a time surely comes when the Estimates are mysteriously swelled, no one can say how, and there is less than ever to show for the outlay; when the fruits of Liberal policy have been consumed; when one class after another manifests signs of disappointment; and when the nation, roused from its indolent good-nature, realises that a paramount regard for national interests is, after all, the only Principle on which national interests can be permanently secured.

### III.

Those who recognise the Principles here laid down as distinctively Liberal, will hardly dispute that, in their nature, they are capable of infinite new applications. But it may reasonably be asked why Liberal Policy is now in abeyance if these principles be living principles, and whether they are of any practical value in their bearing on the politics, not of the remote future, but of the present? The first of these questions admits of a simple answer. Liberal Policy

is now, and may continue awhile to be, in abeyance, owing to a concurrence of causes which imply no weakness in Liberal Principles. In the first place, no Party in opposition is bound to formulate a schedule of the measures which it would endeavour to carry, if it should regain power at some indefinite period. The late Sir Robert Peel said that he was not in the habit of prescribing before he was called in, and Mr. Disraeli once intimated, with more amusing frankness, that it would be absurd to expect a declaration of policy until he should get access to the pigeon-holes of the public offices. Even if the Liberal Party had now a leader with as full an authority as Mr. Disraeli then possessed, he would show little prudence by disclosing gratuitously, to friends and enemies alike, the plan of his next campaign. But it is no secret that, at present, the future leader of the Liberal Party is not yet designated, and Lord Hartington, who has magnanimously consented to fill a peculiarly difficult position, is more than justified in studious reticence. Mr. Gladstone may well shrink from undertaking to resume the leadership whenever the party may next be in office, and may well hold that whoever is destined to lead the party in office should learn to lead it in opposition. Still, while Mr. Gladstone, with unabated powers, remains a possible leader, it is hardly possible for any one else to act effectively in that capacity. Nor is this all: however clearly the objects of a prospective Liberal Policy may be defined in the minds of those who must hereafter be called upon to shape it, unforeseen circumstances must determine which of such objects should be put in the foreground and which left in the background when the proper occasion arises. One of these circumstances is the state of that popular sentiment miscalled public opinion. A nation, like an individual, has its nobler and its duller moods; and so long as the people at large manifest no aspiration towards a higher political or social condition, there is no room for a Liberal Policy worthy of the name.

It is not, however, to be disguised that real and practical differences of opinion divide the various sections of the Liberal Party from each other. There are those who hold the separation of Church from State to be the first and most urgent duty of Liberal statesmanship, and there are those who advocate the extension of household suffrage to counties as the keystone of future Liberal Policy, while there are those who deprecate both these measures as either mischievous or premature. There are those who advise the Liberal Party to stake itself upon effecting organic changes in the Constitution, such as the abolition or sweeping reform of the House of Lords, while there are those who think it safer to keep great noblemen in the House of Lords than to risk having them in the House of Commons, and who prefer an unreformed House of Lords because

it is less capable of resisting the popular will. There are those whose test of Liberal orthodoxy is the adhesion to schemes which they cherish as vitally affecting the moral or social good of the community, but which they know to be condemned by other members of the Liberal party; while there are those who consider it better generalship to select as rallying points, not those positions which a few Liberals may be eager to defend with their lives, but those positions around which the whole Liberal army can be marshalled in battle-array.

Such differences, so long as they prevail, are doubtless fatal to party discipline; but must they of necessity prevail for ever, and shall the harmonious unity of Liberal principles result in no possible unity of Liberal action? To answer this, we must touch, however briefly, on certain open questions of Liberal Policy; and since it would be of no avail to discuss those of lesser difficulty, let us grapple at once with those which divide the Party most, not for the purpose of pretending to solve them, but for the purpose of ascertaining whether they are really incapable of solution by the light of Liberal Principles.

1. To begin, then, with the County Franchise—what do Liberals and Conservatives respectively think of its extension to all ratepaying householders? The Conservative is naturally averse to it, hating every approach to manhood suffrage, viewing the political emancipation of agricultural labourers with unfeigned distrust, and fearing lest they should combine with Radical artizans, under the influence of agitators, against landlords and farmers. At the same time, if Mr. Disraeli were quite sure that it would succeed as a party manœuvre, he might prepare himself for another leap in the dark, hoping that, on the whole, the votes of the more enlightened labourers would be neutralized by those of the illiterate residuum. The Liberal instinctively looks at the question from a precisely opposite point of view. Without laying any stress on abstract rights, he regards it as a source of national strength that as many citizens as possible should take part in politics, and feels ashamed that almost the whole class of husbandmen should have been disfranchised, on the plea of incompetency, for three centuries after the Reformation. He may or he may not agree with Mr. Trevelyan in considering them as having now attained their political majority; but if not, he is only the more eager to promote their political education, welcomes gladly every sign of growing independence, and only dreads lest the more intelligent labourers should be swamped, as the Conservative hopes, by those who vote at the bidding of employers, publicans, or ministers of religion. In short, the differences among Liberals on this subject are mere differences of judgment about the proper time of doing what all desire to see done. Every year inevitably lessens the degree of such differences, and it

is morally certain that, before many sessions have passed, the Liberal Party will be united, either in extending the county franchise, or in converting into a reality some illusory extension of it to be proposed by the Conservative Party.

2. Take, again, two groups of questions more intimately connected with each other than is generally realised—the questions which relate to Land and Local Government respectively. What Liberal defends the present Law of Primogeniture or power of strict entail, the cumbrous formalities which favour the aggrégation of landed property and prevent its dispersion, the inadequate security against encroachments on common rights, the feudal spirit or the magisterial administration of the Game Laws? On every one of these points, it is true, diverse opinions might be culled from Liberal speeches and writings, as diverse criticisms were offered by Liberals on the Agricultural Holdings Bill. But does any one doubt that if a well-matured remedy for all or any one of these anomalies, so dear to Conservatives, were brought forward by a responsible Liberal Government, it would command the loyal support of the Liberal Party? In the same way, Liberal borough members cannot be expected to adopt precisely the same view as Liberal county members of Local Government and Taxation. No political connection will obliterate the natural distinction between urban and rural interests, but then no rational Ministry, chosen from the Liberal party, would ignore that natural distinction, while the revival of self-government in country districts, and the concentration of municipal authorities in towns, would command a cordial assent from all sections of the Party. A Whig nobleman is, of course, better satisfied than a Radical alderman with the present stratification of society and distribution of powers in counties; but the Whig nobleman, like the Radical alderman, believes in progress, in liberty, in civil equality, in the prevailing virtue and good sense of his countrymen, in political justice, and in the supremacy of national over private ends. For him, therefore, a reform of county-government in a democratic sense has no terrors, especially if accompanied by such changes as may attract into the service of local government, both in counties and in municipalities, the rightful aristocracy, not of birth or of wealth, but of education. There is some reason to believe that, if Mr. Gladstone's Administration had remained in office, a popular and comprehensive settlement of these questions relating to Land and Local Government would have been its next great enterprise. As there is very little danger of such settlement being effected by Conservatives, it remains for Liberals to consider whether these questions, perilous as they may seem, are not really among those upon which there is most practical convergence of Liberal opinion.

3. But even supposing that Liberal Principles afford a solution of the County Franchise question, the various Land questions, and the

questions which concern Local Government, what are we to say of the Education question? Let us say, boldly, what is the simple truth, that on no other political question is the essential agreement between Liberals so profound, as on no other have their superficial differences been so grossly magnified by themselves as well as by their opponents. All Liberals concur in regarding primary education as the imperative duty not only of parents but of the State. All would prefer a municipal to a voluntary or denominational system of school government; all would object to giving one child, by reason of its parents' creed, any advantage over another in respect of secular teaching, and nearly all would object to excluding religious teaching from schools aided by public funds. Every one of these conclusions is a simple deduction from the Liberal principles of liberty, civil equality, and confidence in the people; every one, except the last, has been stoutly controverted by Conservatives. Then what is the extent of the differences which are paraded as if they were irreconcilable? That some Liberals were for giving more favourable, and some for giving less favourable, terms to existing schools on the voluntary system, which it was evident must sooner or later give way to schools on the municipal, or School Board, system. That Mr. Forster often spoke, and sometimes acted, as if his object were to "supplement" the voluntary system, whereas the object of many Liberals was more or less gradually to supersede that system—which has actually been, and could not fail to be, the effect of his measure. That some Liberals desired to make education universally compulsory from the first, while others thought it wiser to proceed by steps, and to cover the country with good schools before compelling all children to go into them. Surely, we must needs confess that Liberal Principles have little to do with common sense if differences so trifling and so transitory could produce a perpetual rupture in the Liberal Party. The fact is that, at the present moment, this rupture is at an end for all purposes of political action, and that nothing stands in the way of a combined movement for the complete organization of education, primary, secondary, and academical, on a truly Liberal basis. For Liberals value national education as the most powerful corrective of social irregularities and theological prejudices; they protest, as one man, against stereotyping the isolation of classes and sects in schools and universities; and they will never cease to resist the bigotry which treats dogmatic antipathies as if they were grounded in religion and morality.

4. In this spirit they will unanimously reconsider the far more formidable question of the relation between Church and State, whenever it shall become necessary to deal with it by legislation. Here, if anywhere, the Liberal party is supposed to be rent asunder by a schism which cannot be healed. Here, therefore, if anywhere, the cohesive power of Liberal principles may be tested, and for this



purpose we shall find it instructive to examine the position of a Liberal who thinks it expedient to maintain the Church of England, not for the sake of its doctrinal teaching or Episcopal constitution, but for the sake of religious liberty and of national interest. Such a Liberal will heartily recognise the merits of self-government, ecclesiastical as well as civil, and may well envy Presbyterians that habit of popular control over Church affairs which is the strongest and healthiest root of Scotch Liberalism. He will freely admit that acting gregariously, in Convocation or elsewhere, the clergy of the Church have generally been on the side of reaction, and sometimes of oppression. He will admit further that a zealous and influential section of the clergy is bent on divesting the Church of its Protestant character, and making it an instrument of the Romish Propaganda. These considerations, however, instead of inclining him to Disestablishment, convince him that Disestablishment would be fraught with national danger. He knows that, by virtue of its connection with the State, the Church of England is penetrated with lay ideas beyond any other communion in Christendom, and that a severance of this connection is the darling object of those who desire to convert its clergy from ministers of the people into a true sacerdotal order. He does not forget that, whereas Convocation is impotent to alter the doctrine or discipline of the Church in the minutest particular, the national Legislature is omnipotent to modify both as it may see fit. He foresees that what is called Disestablishment would practically mean the establishment by law of a vast and irresponsible corporation, separated from the nation for the first time in English history, but endowed with so enormous a share of national property that it would become a menacing power in the State, holding a fortress in every parish, and commanding all the grandest ecclesiastical buildings in England. This corporation, he cannot but fear, would be clerical and episcopal in a sense of which England has yet had no experience, for the secular ministrations now undertaken by clergymen as servants of the State would then be merged in public worship and religious instruction, while in any future Synod a preponderance would certainly be secured to clerical votes over lay votes, and to the votes of bishops over those of the inferior clergy. The example of Scotland and America does not encourage him to hope that a Church so constituted would be less exclusive socially or less aristocratic in its spirit than the present Church of England—that it would contain a larger or nearly so large a proportion of philosophical thought and enlightened charity. The example of Holland and Belgium teaches him that Ultramontanism is strong where Erastianism is weak, and observations made nearer home warn him to beware lest, in clutching at a phantom of religious equality, he should let go the substance of religious liberty. For these and like reasons, each of which constitutes a good Ritualistic argument in

favour of Disestablishment, he looks upon the Radical demand for Disestablishment as no legitimate expression of Liberal Principles. He can easily understand why the High Church Party should treat Comprehension as an exploded chimera, should deprecate all Parliamentary interference with Church-government, and should be willing to invest a sectarian fragment of the nation with that power over the ancient Church of England which the whole nation actually possesses and ought to exercise. What surprises him is that such an alternative should commend itself to any Liberal, and he would fain suggest for the consideration of the Liberal Party three very simple queries, which often recur to his own mind:—Whether the wisest Churchmen are not prepared to popularise and reform the Church system to any extent that may be necessary in order to harmonize it with the political development of the nation and the spiritual wants of each local community?—Whether the wisest Nonconformists are not prepared to accept such an ecclesiastical settlement as would bring Church affairs, with the disposition of national Church property, within the sphere and under the effective control of local government?—Whether the gulf between these lines of Church-reform is so impassable that no statesmanship, though inspired by Liberal Principles, can ever bridge it over?

It thus appears that on the most important issues of current politics, and even on the most intractable of all, the unity of Liberal Principles is not only distinctive enough to repel amalgamation with Conservatism, but definite enough to indicate a basis of united Liberal action. Nothing but degeneracy in the Liberal Party can long arrest the revival of such action, for the necessity for it is as urgent as ever. As we survey the world around us, we cannot flatter ourselves that Liberalism “has attained the *euthanasia* of political theories, and passed from the agitation of controversy into the dignified repose of tacit recognition.” While the air is thick with projects of social improvement, and Conservatives are troubled with visions of a coming Democracy, the prospect of Liberal Principles becoming obsolete seems almost as remote as that of gravitation being superseded by some higher law of nature. Doubtless it is possible to imagine a new order of things in which these Principles shall perish, as it were, of inanition, when there shall be no further advance to be made, no liberties to be vindicated, no inequalities to be removed, no rights of humanity to be upheld, no wrongs to be redressed, and no private interests to be overruled for the public weal. Enough for us that such a consummation is neither within our grasp nor within our view, that fresh heights are ever rising before us on the horizon, and that, now as ever, Liberal Principles are the only Principles by which the great movement of national life can be safely guided towards its unknown destination.

GEORGE C. BRODRICK.

## DUTCH GUIANA.<sup>1</sup>

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE RIVER.

"The river nobly foams and flows,  
The charm of this enchanted ground,  
And all its thousand turns disclose  
Some fresher beauty varying round."

BYRON.

WITH a subdued silvery gleam, the surest promise in these latitudes of a clear day to follow, the sun peeped through the network of the forest that here does duty for horizon on every side, when our party mustered under the neat wooden pavilion of the landing place between the parade ground and the river, I might have not less correctly said the highway. For the true highways of this land are its rivers, traced right and left with matchless profusion by nature herself, and more commodious could scarce be found anywhere. Broad and deep, tidal, too, for miles up their course, but with scarcely any variation in the fulness of their mighty flow summer or winter, rainy season or dry, so constant is the water-supply from its common origin, the Equatorial mountain-chain, they give easy access to the innermost recesses of the vast regions beyond, east, west, and south; and where their tortuous windings and multiplied side canals fail to reach, Batavian industry and skill have made good the want by canals, straighter in course, and often hardly inferior in navigable capacity to the mother rivers themselves. On the skeleton plan, so to speak of this mighty system of water communication, the entire cultivation of the inland has been naturally adjusted; and the estates of Surinam are ranged one after another along the margins of rivers and canals, just as farms might be along highways and byways in Germany or Hungary. Subservient to the water ways, narrow land paths follow the river or trench by which not every estate alone, but its every subdivision of an estate, every acre almost is defined and bordered, while the smaller dykes and canals are again crossed by wooden bridges, maintained in careful repair, but paths and bridges alike are of a width and solidity adapted to footmen only, or at best horsemen; the proper carriage road is the river or canal.

In a climate like that of Surinam, bodily exertion is a thing to be economized as much as possible; and accordingly everybody keeps his carriage, I mean his boat. That of the wealthy estate owner, of the vicarious "attorney" (not a professional one, I may as

(1) Continued from *Fortnightly Review* for December, 1875.

well remark for the benefit of those unused to West-Indian nomenclatures, but the holder of a power of attorney, on the proprietor's behalf), of the merchant, of the higher official, and generally of every one belonging to this or the other of what are conveniently called the "upper classes," is a comfortable barge, painted white for coolness sake, and propelled by oars varying in number from four to eight.

A fresh painted, well-kept eight-oar, with a cabin of the kind just described, but of the very largest dimensions, the sides, coiling, hangings, cushions, all white; with a dash of gilding here and there; eight rowers dressed in loose white suits, with broad red sashes round their waists, and on their heads blue caps to complete the triple colours of the national flag, make a pretty show on the sunlit river; and the Governor's barge might, for picturesque appearance, match the Caique of a Stamboul dignitary, besides being as much superior to the eastern conveyance in comfort, as inferior in speed. The white painted six-oar, four-oar, or even two-oar barges too, that abound for ordinary voyaging, though of course smaller in their dimensions and less gay in their accessories, are pleasant objects to look at, and may bring to mind the gondolas of Venetian waters; with this difference, that whereas the Adriatic crews are white, or what should be white, and the boats black, here the colours are, and not disadvantageously for pictorial effect, exactly reversed.

So much for the "genteler sort." Larger yet and more solidly built, are the great lighter-like barges, whether open or partly covered, that convey down stream from the river-side estates casks of sugar or molasses, barrels of rum, sacks of cocoa, heaped-up yams, plantains, sweet potatoes, cocoa-nuts, cassava, and the hundred other well-known but too little cultivated products of this teeming land. Alongside of these may be often seen the floating cottages of the so-called "bush negroes," well thatched and snug; each occupying half or more of a wide flat-bottomed boat, where two stalwart blacks in genuine African garb, that is, next to no garb (*vid.* the woodcuts in Winwood Reade's amusing narratives, *passim*), paddle rather than row; and any number of black ladies, hardly more encumbered by their costumes than their lords, with an appropriate complement of ebony children, these last in no costume at all, look out from the cabin doors. In their wake follows a raft of cut timber, green-heart probably, or brown-heart, or purple-heart, or balata, or letter-wood, or locust-wood, or whatever other forest-growth finds its market in town; and standing on it, one or more statuesque figures, that look as if they had been cut out of dark porphyry by no unskilful hand, and well polished afterwards, guide its downward course. Most numerous of all, light corials, that have retained the Indian name as well as build, each one hollowed out of a single tree-trunk, with sometimes a couple of extra planks roughly tacked on to the sides

by way of bulwarks, paddle past us, under the guidance of one or two ragged negro labourers, or husbandmen, who exchange shouts, sometimes of jest, sometimes of quarrel, with their fellows in other boats or on the shore. These little skiffs, drawing scarce a foot of water when deepest laden, pass through the narrowest ditches that divide almost every acre of cultivated land on the estates from the other, and are the chief means of passage for the working folks on their way to and fro between country and town. When not in actual use they are kept sunk in water just deep enough to cover them, and thus preserved from the sun-heat, which would otherwise soon split the unseasoned wood. Lastly, a few clumsy boats of the ordinary longshore type, in the service of trade with the ships that lie anchored, giving out or taking in cargo off the town-wharf, mix up with the rest, and add their quota of variety to the river crafts of Surinam.

However, on the present occasion it is neither barge, plain or gay, nor a boat, not even a corial, that is waiting to receive our party. A flat-bottomed river steamer, one of the three that belong to the service of the colony, lies off the wharf; she draws about ten feet of water, and her duty is just now to convey us up the Commeweyne River, and its main tributary the Cottica, where lies the district which His Excellency has selected for our inspection, because affording the greatest variety of scenery and cultivation within easy reach of Paramaribo. I have said that the colony possesses three of these boats; the largest of them makes a voyage along the sea-coast as far as Georgetown twice every month; the two smaller confine their excursions within the limits of river navigation.

In a few minutes we were all on board, a merry party, Dutch and English, official and non-official, military, naval, civilian and burgher, but all of us bent alike on pleasing and being pleased to the best of our opportunities. Our boat was well supplied, too, with whatever Dutch hospitality—no unsubstantial virtue—could furnish for convivial need, and was commanded by a paragon of boat-captains—a bright-eyed, brown-faced little man, Scotch by his father's side, Indian by his mother's; himself uniting in physiognomy as in character the shrewdness and practical good sense of the former parentage with the imperturbable calm and habitual good-humour of the latter. Under such auspices we started on our way.

To enter the Commeweyne River we were first obliged to retrace a portion of the route by which I had arrived three days before, and to follow the downward course of the Surinam River for about eight miles, passing the same objects, no longer wholly new, but now more interesting than before, because nearer and better understood. Here is a plantation, seen by glimpses through the mangrove scrub that borders the river's bank; a narrow creek, at the mouth of which

several moored barges and half-submerged corials are gathered, gives admittance to the heart of the estate. It is a vast cocoa-grove, where you may wander at will under three hundred and fifty continuous acres of green canopy—that is, if you are ready to jump over any number of small brimming ditches, and to cross the wider irrigation trenches on bridges, the best of which is simply a round and slippery trec-trunk, excellently adapted, no doubt, to the naked foot of a negro labourer, but on which no European boot or shoe can hope to maintain an instant's hold. Huge pods, some yellow, some red—the former colour is, I am told, indicative of better quality—dangle in your face, and dispel the illusion by which you might at first sight of the growth and foliage around you have fancied yourself to be in the midst of a remarkably fine alder-tree thicket; while from distance to distance broad-boughed trees of the kind called by the negroes “coffee-mamma,” from the shelter they afford to the plantations of that bush, spread their thick shade high aloft, and protect the cocoa bushes and their fruit from the direct action of the burning sun. Moisture, warmth, and shade—these are the primary and most essential conditions for the well-doing of a cocoa estate. Innumerable trenches, dug with mathematical exactitude of alternate line and interspace, supply the first requisite; a temperature that, in a wind-fenced situation like this, bears a close resemblance for humid warmth to that of an accurately shut hothouse, assures the second; and the “coffee-mamma,” a dense-leaved tree, not unlike our own beech, guarantees the third. Thus favoured, a Surinam cocoa crop is pretty sure to be an abundant one. Ever and anon, where the green labyrinth is at its thickest, you come suddenly across a burly Creole negro, busily engaged in plucking the large pods from the boughs with his left hand, and holding in it so, while with a sharp cutlass held in his right he dexterously cuts off the upper part of the thick outer covering, then shakes the slimy agglomeration of seed and white burr clinging to it into a basket set close by him on the ground. A single labourer will in this fashion collect nearly four hundred pounds' weight of seeds in the course of a day. When full the baskets are carried off on the heads of the assistant field-women, or, if taken from the remoter parts of the plantation, are floated down in boats or corials to the brick-paved courtyard adjoining the planter's dwelling-house, where the nuts are cleansed and dried by simple and inexpensive processes, not unlike those in use for the coffee-berry; after which nothing remains but to fill the sacks, and send them off to their market across the seas.

A Guiana cocoa-plantation is an excellent investment. The first outlay is not heavy, nor is the maintenance of the plantation expensive—the number of labourers bearing an average proportion of one to nine to that of the acres under cultivation. The work required

is of a kind that negroes, who are even now not unfrequently prejudiced by the memory of slave days against the cane-field and sugar-factory, undertake willingly enough; and to judge by their stout limbs and evident good condition, they find it not unsuited to their capabilities. More than four million pounds' weight of cocoa are yearly produced in Surinam, "which is a consideration," as a negro remarked to me, laboriously attempting to put his ideas into English, instead of the Creole mixture of every known language that they use among themselves. Neither Coolies nor Chinese are employed on these cocoa estates, much to the satisfaction of the Creoles, who though tolerant of, or rather clinging to, European mastership, have little sympathy with other coloured or semi-civilised races. Some authors have indeed conjectured that the West Indian labourer of the future will be a cross-mixture of the African and the Asiatic; but to this conclusion, desirable or not, there is for the present no apparent tendency, either in Surinam or elsewhere. As to the Indians of these regions, they keep to themselves, and their incapacity of improvement, combined with hereditary laziness and acquired drunkenness, will, it seems, soon render them a mere memory, poetical or otherwise, of the past.

Soil, climate, and the conditions of labour, all here combine to favour the cocoa-plant; and accordingly, out of the thirty thousand acres actually under cultivation in Dutch Guiana, we find that a sixth part is dedicated to its production. More would be so, but for the time required before a fresh plantation can bear a remunerative crop; five or six years must, in fact, elapse during which no return at all is made, "which is a consideration" also, though in an opposite sense to that quoted above.

Cocoa prospers; but after all said and done, sugar, the one thing that for two centuries and more has been to the West Indies—Dutch, French, Spanish, or English—what cloth is to Manchester, cutlery to Sheffield, or beer to Bavaria, is even now, despite of emancipation, free-trade, beetroot, prohibitive regulations, American tariffs, and the whole array of adversities mustered against it for the last fifty years, the "favourite" of the agricultural racecourse, and holds with regard to other products, however valuable, the same position as the queen of the chessboard does when compared with the remaining pieces. Indeed in some—Demerara, for instance—sugar reigns, like Alexander Selkirk on his island, not only supreme, but alone; while in Surinam, where, more than in the generality of West-Indian regions, she has many and, to a certain extent, successful rivals to contend with, she vindicates a full half of the reclaimed soil for her exclusive domain. Previous to emancipation, four-fifths at least were her allotted share. No fuller evidence of her former sway need be sought than that which is even yet every-

where supplied by the aspect of the great houses, gardens, and all the belongings of the old sugar plantations, once the wealth and mainstay of the Dutch colony. The garb is now too often, alas, "a world too wide for the shrunk shanks" of the present, but it witnesses to the time when it was cut to fitness and measure.

And here on our way, almost opposite the cocoa-plantation with its modern and modest demesnes that we have just visited, appears the large sugar-estate of Voorburg, close behind Fort Amsterdam, at the junction point of the river. Let us land and gladden the heart of the manager—the owner is, like too many others, and the more the pity, an absentee—by a visit. Happy indeed would he be, in his own estimation at least, were we to comply with his well-meant request of riding round every acre and inspecting every cane on the grounds. But as these cover five hundred and sixty acres of actual cultivation, besides about a thousand more of yet unreclaimed concession; as the sun, too, is now high enough to be very hot, and we have other places to visit and sights to see, we will excuse ourselves as best we can, though by so doing we mark an indifference on our part to the beauties of the cane-field that he may forgive, but cannot comprehend.

I may remark by the way that in this respect every planter, every manager, Dutch, English, Scotch, or Irish, in the West Indies is exactly the same. None of them, in the intense and personal interest they take in every furrow, every cane, can understand how any one else can feel less; or how, to the uninitiated eye one acre of reed is very like another; one ditch resembles another ditch; just as the sheep in a flock are mere repetitions the one of the other to all but the shepherd; or as one baby resembles any baby to every apprehension except to that of the mother or, occasionally, the nurse. Let us, however, respect what we are not worthy to share; and do thou decline regretfully, O my friend, but firmly—if thou desirest not headache and twelve hours' subsequent stupefaction at the least—the friendly invitation to "ride round" the estates, in a sun heat say of 140° F., for two whole hours, it cannot be less; while a super-copious breakfast, and all kinds of cheerful but too seductive drinks, are awaiting you on your return. Accompany us rather on the quiet circuit we will now make about the house, the labourers' cottages, the outbuildings, and two, at most three, acres of cane, and when in future visiting on thy own account, go thou and do likewise.

Nor is even the following picture of Voorburg to be taken as a photographic likeness, but rather an idealised view, combining details taken from other subjects with those of the above-named locality, and true to many, indeed most, sugar estates of this region, because limited to the exact facts, statistical or pictorial, of none.

Wood or brick, more often the former, the landing-place or



"Stelling" receives us, and on traversing it we are at once welcomed by the shelter—half a minute's exposure to the sun will have made you desire it—of a cool, well-swept, well-trimmed avenue, most often, as it happens to be at Voorburg itself, of mahogany trees, dark and clustering, sometimes of light green almond-trees, or locust-trees, or it may be of palms, especially betel; this last selected rather for the perfect beauty of symmetry, in which it excels all other palms, than for shade. To this avenue, which may be from fifty to a hundred yards long, succeeds an open garden, laid out in walks where "caddie" does duty for gravel, and flower-beds in which roses, geraniums, verbenas, jessamines, and other well-known Europeanized flowers and plants, mix with their tropical rivals, of equal or greater beauty and sweetness; their names, ah me, I am no botanist; enough if wonderful passion-flowers, noble scarlet lilies, and gorgeous cactus-blossoms be mentioned here; Canon Kingsley's chapter on the Botanical Gardens of Trinidad may be safely consulted for the rest. Among the beds and garden-walks keep sentinel, in true Batavian fashion, quaint white-painted wooden statues, mostly classical after Lemprière, "all heathen goddesses most rare," Venuses, Dianas, Apollos, Terpsichores, Fortunes on wheels, Bacchuses, Fawns, occasionally a William, a Van Tromp, or some other hero of Dutch land or main, these last recognisable by the vestiges of cocked hats and tail coats, as the former by the absence of those or any other articles of raiment; and all with their due proportion of mutilated noses, lopped hands, and the many injuries of sun, rain, and envious time.

But stay, I had almost forgotten to mention the two iron popguns, that command the landing place, and flank on either side the entry of the avenue; imitation cannon, that in everything except their greater size are the very counterparts of those "devilish engines" that our early childhood thought it a great achievement to load and fire off. Here the children's part is played not unsuccessfully by the negroes themselves, who at seventy years of age have no less pleasure than we ourselves might have felt at seven, in banging off their artillery in and out of all possible seasons, but especially on the approach of distinguished and popular visitors like His Excellency the Governor, with whom I am happily identified, so to speak, during this trip. But this is not all; for within the garden, close under the house windows are ranged two, four, or even six more pieces, some shaped like cannon, others like mortars; and these too are crammed up to their very mouths with powder and improvised wadding, and exploded on festive occasions; when, as ill-hap will have it, their over-repletion often results in bursting, and their bursting in the extemporised amputation of some negro arm, leg, or head, as the case may be. But though I heard of many a heartrending or limb-rending event of the kind, I am thankful to say that I witnessed none during our tour, though of explosions many.

Next a flight of steps, stone or brick, guarded by a handsome parapet in the Dutch style, and surmounted by a platform, with more or less of architectural pretension, leads up to the wide front door; by this we pass and find ourselves at once in the large entrance hall, that here, as formerly in European dwellings, serves for dining room and reception room generally. The solid furniture, of wood dark with age, gives it a quasi old-English look; and the gloom, for the light is allowed but a scanty entrance, lest her sister heat should enter too, is quasi English also. But the stiff portraits on the wall, ancestors, relatives, Netherland celebrities, royal personages, governors, &c., &c., are entirely Dutch and belong to the wooden school of art. The central table is of any given size and strength, and has been evidently calculated for any amount of guests and viands. We shall partake of the latter before leaving, and bestow well-merited praise on cook and cellar. Besides the hall are other apartments, counting-rooms, and so forth; above it is a second story, above it a third, for the brick walls are strong, and hurricanes are here as in Demerara unknown; over all rises a high-pitched roof; the wolf, or griffin, or lion, or whatever crest the original proprietor may have boasted, figures atop as gable ornament or vane. The whole forms a manor-house that might have been transported, by substantial Dutch cherubs of course, as the Loretto bauble was by slim Italian angiolets, from amid the poplars of Arnheim or Bredvoort, and set down on the banks of Commeweyne. Only the not unfrequent adjuncts of a trellised verandah, and a cool outside gallery, are manifestly not of extra-tropical growth.

We have received our welcome, and drunk our prelusory schnapps. And now for the sight-seeing. The factory, where the canes, crushed into mere fibre as fast as the negroes can lift them from the canal-barge alongside on to the insatiable rollers close by, give out their continuous green frothy stream, to be clarified, heated, boiled, reboiled, tormented fifty ways, till it finds refuge in the hogsheads or rum barrels; resembling in every stage of its course its counterpart in Demerara, or Jamaica, minus, however, except in one solitary instance, the expensive refinements of the centrifugal cylinder and vacuum pan. But for mere delectation, unless heat, vapour, noise, and an annihilation of everything in general be delectation, which I hardly think, no man need linger in a factory, nor, unless he desires premature intoxication on vapour, in a rum-distillery either. Worth attention, however, and admiration too, is the solidity of construction by which the huge mass of building, doubly heavy from the ponderous machinery it contains, besides its clustering group of out-houses, megass-sheds, tall chimneys, store-places, and the rest, is enabled to support itself upright and unyielding on a soil so marshy and unstable. The foundations in many

instances, I am told, exceed by double in dimension the buildings above.

Ingenious bees these sugar-making ones. Let us next look at the hives of the workers. These workers, or, metaphor apart, labourers, are here, at Voorburg I mean, and on not a few other estates, of three kinds, Coolie, Chinese, and Creole. And, should any one, smitten with a desire for accuracy and statistics, wish to know their exact numbers in this particular instance, the Coolies at Voorburg are ninety all told, the Chinese one hundred and eighty-one, the Creoles or colonial-born negroes, two hundred.

First to the Coolies. Their introduction into Surinam is of recent date, little over two years, in fact; but everything has been organized for them on exactly the same footing as in Demerara or Trinidad. They have their Agents, here and in India, their official protector, a very efficient one in the person of Mr. A. C——, Her Majesty's Consul; their labour and pay regulations are textually identical with those of Demerara; they are duly provided with a medical staff and hospitals; in a word, they are, if anything, more fenced in here from every shadow of a grievance than even in an English colony; Mr. Jenkins himself could not ask more for his protégés. The eye recognises at once the regulation cottages, all like pretty maids—but here the similarity ceases—of a row, with garden spaces attached, back yards, verandahs, and every attention paid by the constructors to dryness, ventilation, and whatever else a Parliamentary Inspector of the most practical type could desire. Thus much is done for the immigrants; but except to amass money, with an occasional whiff at the hookah between times, from morning to night, the “mild Hindoo” is not inclined to do much for himself. His garden, ill planted and ill cared for, is a sorry sight; his dwelling, for what concerns the interior, is a cross between a gypsy-hut and a rag-shop, and a pinched, stingy, meanness characterizes his every belonging no less than himself. That he may also excel, in “grace, ease, courtesy, self-restraint, dignity, sweetness, and light,” I am ready, of course, with all believers in “At Last,” to admit. But I do it on faith, the evidence of things not seen either in the West Indies or the East. Low-caste Hindoos in their own land are, to all ordinary apprehension, slovenly, dirty, ungraceful, generally unacceptable in person and surroundings; and the Coolies of Voorburg may have been low-caste, very likely. Yet offensive as is the low-caste Indian, were I estate-owner, or colonial governor, I had rather see the lowest Pariahs of the low, than a single trim, smooth-faced, smooth-waved, clever, high-caste Hindoo on my lands or in my colony.

But for the untidiness, I might say shiftlessness of the Surinam-planted Coolies, some allowance must be made. They are new comers, in a new land, among what are to them new races, and if it

takes some time even for the European under such like circumstances to pluck up heart and be a-doing, the process of adaptation is yet slower for the Asiatic. In Demerara, where they have now dwelt for years with Europeans to stimulate and direct them, and negroes to teach them gardening without doors and tidiness within, the Coolies certainly make a better show, and so do their dwellings. But they have much as yet to learn in Surinam.

Passing a dyke or two, we come next on the Chinese cottages, in construction and outward arrangement identical with those of the Coolies, or nearly so. The gardens here show a decided improvement, not indeed in the shape of flowers, or of any of the pretty graceful things of the soil, for of such there are none here; but there are useful vegetables and potherbs in plenty; spade and hoe, manure and water, care and forethought, have done their work and are receiving their reward. But the inside of a Chinese dwelling—*guarda e passa*. Well, Chinamen are fond of pigs, and if they have a fancy themselves to live in pigstyes, it is all in character.

A dyke or two more has to be crossed, and we enter the Creole village. Here regulation has done less, and individual will and fancy more. But the negroes are Dutch trained, and have an idea of straight lines and orderly rows, by no means African; though in the English-like preference given to isolated dwellings in which each household can live apart, over conjoint ones, they do but follow the custom of their ancestral birth-place. Their gardens are well-stocked, not with fruit and vegetables only, with plantains, mangoes, bananas, yams, sweet-potatoes, peas, and the like things good for food, but also with whatever is pleasant to the eye; with gay flowers, twining creepers, bright berries, scarlet and black; in fine, with the brilliant colours and strong contrasts that befit African taste. Inside their dwellings are comfortable, and in most instances clean, neatly arranged too, though the space is very often overcrowded with furniture, the tables covered with cheap glass and crockery, more for show than use, and the walls hung round with a confused medley of gaudy prints. These Creoles evidently know how to enjoy life, and have resolved to make the best of it; the wisest resolution, it may be, for us mortals in our little day.

Enough of Creoles, Chinese, and Coolies for this once; we are yet at the outset of our voyage. Returning towards the factory, we pay a visit to the airy and well-constructed hospital; sore-feet seem the principal complaint. The climate is, in itself, a healthy one; epidemics are rare, marsh-fever scarcely heard of, and yellow-fever, like cholera, a historical event of years past. Hence disease when it occurs is mostly traceable to some distinct cause of individual folly, unreasonable custom, or, as is frequently the case with the self-stinting Coolie, insufficient diet. Nor is there any doubt that

here, as in almost every other West Indian colony—Demerara is one of the few honourable exceptions—sanitary regulations and medical service are far from their best. Let them be reformed, as they easily may, and the inhabitant, European or other, of the Guiana coast will have no reason to complain of his lot, so far as climate is concerned, even when contrasted with the bracing atmosphere and invigorating breezes of the northern sea-shore.

A look at the truly regal King-Palm, an African importation, and said to be the only specimen in the colony, that waves its crown of dense fronds, each thirty and forty feet long, in front of the Voorburg residence, and we re-embark; not sorry, after the hot sunshine we have endured, to find ourselves once more under the boat-awning in the temperate river breeze.

In a few minutes more we have rounded the point of Fort Amsterdam, where of course flags are flying and officers and soldiers in all the glory of uniform are hastily marshalling themselves alongside of the battery at the water's edge to greet his Excellency, who, hat in hand, acknowledges their salutations from the deck. And now, with the tide to help, we are steaming up the giant Commeweyne, and enter straight on a scene of singular beauty, and a character all its own. For breadth of stream, indeed, and colour or discolour of water, the river hereabouts, that is for about twenty miles of its lower course, might fairly pass for the Danube anywhere between Orsova and Widdin, or perhaps for a main-branch of the Nile about Benha, with the sole discrepancy that whereas the Commeweyne, thanks to the neighbouring Atlantic, is tidal, the two last-named tributaries of the tideless Mediterranean and Black Seas are not so. But that large reddish water-snake, that writhes its ugly way up the current; that timber-raft of rough-hewn but costly materials, bearing on its planks the tall naked African figures that guide its way; that light Indian corial, balanced as venturesomely as any Oxford skiff, and managed by a boatman as skilful, however ragged his clothes, and reckless his seeming, as the precisest Oxford undergraduate; that gleaming gondola-like barge, with its covered cabin—is the reclining form within dark or fair?—and its cheery-singing crew—all these are objects not of Bulgarian, nor even, though not absolutely dissimilar, of Egyptian river-life. The hot light mirrored on the turbid water, the moist hot breeze, the intense hot stillness of earth and sky, between which the very river seems as if motionless, and sleeping in the monotony of its tepid flow—these also are unknown to the Nile of the Cairene Delta, or the Turko-Wallachian Danube; they belong to a more central zone. Details of the sort might, however, be every one of them, the “bush negroes” and the covered Dutch barges excepted—equally well found, as I myself can bear witness, on the Essequibo, the Demerara, or any

other of the neighbouring Guiana-coast rivers. But not so the scarce interrupted succession of estates, sugar, cocoa, and plantain, to the right and left, each with its quaint name, most often Dutch, telling some tale of the hopes, cares, expectations, anxieties, affections, joys, sorrows, of former owners long ago.

Various as were the early fortunes of the "Estates," their later times have been to the full as varied, or perhaps more. Some have by good management, backed with the requisite capital, retained through all vicissitudes of trade and strife, of slavery, apprenticeship, and emancipation, a sufficiency of Creole labour to keep all or the greater part of their old West-Indian prosperity; and announce themselves accordingly as we sail past, by smoking chimneys, roofs and walls in good repair, and clustering cottages, amid the dense green of cocoa groves, or the verdant monotony of sugar-canes, only interrupted at regular distances by canal and dyke, or by some long palm row, planted more for beauty than for profit. In the distance towers a huge cotton-tree, magnificent to look at, but useless else, and chiefly spared to humour negro superstition, that yet brings offerings of food and drink to the invisible power, rather maleficent than otherwise, supposed to reside under its boughs. Or, again, signs of recent additions and improvements, with long white rows of regulation-built cottages, the tenements of Coolies or Chinese, attest fortunes not only maintained but improved by the infusion of "new blood" from the Indian or the Celestial Empire. Or a reverse process has taken place; the cane has abdicated in favour of less costly, but also less remunerative rivals; and the white proprietor has made place for a black landowner, or more commonly for several, who now cultivate the land in accordance with their narrow means. Here the emerald monotony of the land is broken; patches of cassava-growth, like an infinity of soft green cupolas, crowded one on the other, and undulating to every breath of air, show chequerwise between acres where the metallic glitter of vigorous plantain leaves, or tall hop-like rows of climbing yam, tell of an unexhausted and seemingly inexhaustible soil. Jotted freely amid the lesser growths, fruit trees of every kind spread unpruned with a luxuriance that says more for the quantity than the quality of their crop; but this is the tropical rule, and even Dutch gardening skill is unavailing against the exuberance of growth in climates like these. Meanwhile, the stately residence of the former proprietor, who by the way had in all probability been for many years an absentee, before, by a natural result he became a bankrupt—the transition is a stereotyped one, and recurs every day—has at last been totally abandoned as out of keeping with the simpler requirements of his successors. They content themselves with small cottages half-buried in a medley of flower-bushes, and

kitchen-growth close by ; though in more than one instance our Creole, reverting to the hereditary Oriental instinct of ease and how to take it, has built himself on the green margin of some creek or river inlet, a pretty painted kiosk, worthy of finding place among its likenesses on the shores of the Bosphorus or Nile, and answering the same ends. An unroofed factory and ruined chimney close by combine to mark the present phase, a necessary though a transient one, of land ownership, through which Surinam is passing ; a more hopeful one, though less brilliant, than that of exclusively large Estates and costly factories owned by few.

I am again,—for this is not a diary, where everything is put down according to the order in which it occurred, but rather a landscape picture, where I take the liberty of arranging accessories as best may suit convenience or effect,—I am again on board our steamer onward bound with the rest. Sometimes our course lies along the centre of the river, and then we have a general view of either side, far off, but seen in that clearness of atmosphere unknown to the northern climes, which, while it abolishes the effects of distance, creates a curious illusion, making the smallness of the remoter objects appear not relative but absolute. Sharp-edged and bright-coloured in the sun, houses and cottages stand out in an apparent fore-ground of tree and field ; miniature dwellings, among a miniature vegetation ; with liliputian likenesses of men and women between. Then, again, we approach one or the other bank ; and see ! the little palm-model is sixty feet high at least, and the gabled toy-house a large mansion three or four storeys high. And now the fields and gardens reach down to the very brink of the stream, and our approach has been watched by the labourers from far ; so that by the time we are gliding alongside, troops of blacks, men and women, the former having hastily slipped on their white shirts, the latter rearranged their picturesque head-kerchiefs of every device and colour, gala fashion, hurry down to the landing-place for a welcome. Some bear with them little Dutch or fancy flags, others, the children especially, have wild flowers in their hands ; two or three instruments of music, or what does duty for them, are heard in the crowd ; and a dense group forms, with the eager seriousness befitting the occasion about the two dwarf cannon by the wharfside, which are now banged off amid the triumphant shouts of the one sex and the screams of the other. We, on the deck and paddle-boxes, return the greetings as best we may, the Governor waves his hat, fresh shouts follow ; till the popular excitement—on shore, be it understood—takes the form of a dance, begun for our delectation, and continued for that of the dancers themselves, long after we have glided away. White dresses, dashed here and there by a sprinkling of gay colours ; behind them a glowing screen of garden flowers,

further back and all around the emerald green of cane-fields, overhead tall palms, not half seared and scant of foliage as we too frequently see them in the wind-swept islands of the Caribbean archipelago, but luxuriant with their heavy crowns; or giant flowering trees, crimson and yellow, the whole flooded, penetrated everywhere by the steady brightness of the tropical day,—

“Till all things seem only one  
In the universal sun,”

a gay sight, and harmonizing well with the sounds of welcome, happiness, and mirth. These tell, not indeed perhaps of all-absorbing industry, of venturesome speculation, and colossal success, but of sufficiency, contentment, and well-doing,—good things too in their way.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### COTTICA.

“—a leaf on the one great tree, that up from old time  
Growing, contains in itself the whole of the virtue and life of  
Bygone days, drawing now to itself all kindreds and nations,  
And must have for itself the whole world for its root and branches.”

CLOUGH.

DURING the whole of the eighteenth century Fort Sommelsdyk continued to be a position of the greatest importance, covering the bulk of the colonial estates and the capital itself from the frequent inroads of Cayenne depredators, and their allies, the French maroons. With the final repression of these marauders, the military duties of the post may be said to have ceased; and it has now for several years served only as a police station. No spot could have been better chosen; no truer centre found anywhere. Not only does the Commeweyne River, with its double fringe of estates and cultivation reaching far to the south, here unite with its main tributary, the Cottica, the eastern artery of a wide and populous district; but the same way gives direct access to the Perica River, another important affluent from the south-east; while at a little distance the Mutappica water-course branches off in a northerly direction, and winding amid a populous region of plantations and cane-fields, finds an opening to the sea beyond. Half the cultivation, and, owing to the character of the estates, more than half the rural population of Dutch Guiana, are within the range of these districts; and the selection of this post will ever remain a proof of the administrative, no less than of the military talents of Van Sommelsdyk.

The small fort, a pentagon, erected on a grass-grown promontory



at the meeting of the two great waters, has a very pretty appearance. On every side the further view is shut off by the dense forest through which the rivers make their winding way by channels from thirty to forty feet in depth; no other habitation is in sight; and the cleared space around the fort buildings has an out-of-the-world look, befitting a scene of weird adventure in "Mabinogion" or the "Fairie Queene." But the poetry of the New World is in itself, not in the eyes of those who behold it; and if fairies exist west of the Atlantic, they are invisible for the most. Above its junction, the Commeweyne changes character, and instead of being a broad, slow-flowing volume of brackish water, becomes a comparatively narrow, but deep and rapid stream; while its former muddy colour is exchanged for pure black, not unlike the appearance of the mid-Atlantic depths in its inky glassiness. If taken up, however, in small quantity, the black colour, which is due chiefly to the depth, gives place to a light yellow; otherwise the water is clear, free from any admixture of mud, and perfectly healthy, with a slightly astringent taste. These peculiarities are popularly ascribed to some vegetable extract of the nature of tannin, derived from the decomposing substances of the equatorial forest, underneath which these rivers take their rise.

We for our part no longer pursue our voyage on the Commeweyne, but diverging, follow its tributary—or rather an equal stream—the Cottica, and our course is henceforth east, almost parallel with the sea-line, though at some distance from it. From Fort Sommelsdyk onwards, the view on either bank gains in beauty what it loses in extent. The bendings and turnings of the river are innumerable; indeed, it not rarely coils itself on itself in an almost circular loop, the nearest points of which have been in many instances artificially connected by a short but deep and navigable canal, the work of Dutch industry. Several little islands, each an impenetrable mass of tangled vegetation, have thus been formed; on two larger ones, far up the river, coffee is still grown. It was for many years one of the main articles of cultivation in these districts, though now it has fallen into unmerited neglect; whence it will doubtless be rescued whenever a better proportioned labour supply shall allow the colonists to reoccupy and extend the narrow limits within which their activity is at present restricted. Several creeks, as all lesser watercourses are here called, fall into the main stream, or from distance to distance connect it, by the aid of canals, with the sea. On the banks of one of these flourished, in days gone by, the still famous Helena, a Mulatto syren, whose dusky charms are said to have rivalled in their mischievous effects, if not in other respects, those of her Grecian namesake. These creeks, with the canals and ditches dependent on them, complete the water-system alike of irrigation and traffic throughout this wonderful land, where nature has done so much,

and art and skill yet more. But whatever the sea communication through these occasional openings, no brackish taint ever finds its way to the higher level, through which the Cottica flows; and the freshness of the water is betokened by the over-increasing loveliness and variety of the riverside vegetation. Lowest down hangs the broad fringe of the large-leaved "moco-moco"—a plant that has, I suppose, some authentic Latin name, only I know it not; nor would it, however appropriate, give thee, perhaps, gentle reader, any clearer idea of the plant than may its Indian one,—dipping its glossy green clusters into the very stream. Above tower all the giants of West Indian and South American forests, knit together by endless meshes of convolvulus, liane, creeper, and wild vine, the woorali, I am told, among the rest; and surcharged with parasites, till the burden of a single tree seems sufficient to replenish all the hothouses of England and Wales from store to roof. Piercing through these, the eta-palm—it resembles in growth the toddy-palm of the East Indies, and, for aught my ignorance can object to the contrary, may be the very same—waves its graceful fans high against the steady blue; and birds innumerable—black, white, mottled, plain, blue, yellow, crimson, long-billed, parrot-billed, a whole aviary let loose—fly among the boughs, or strut fearless between the tree-trunks, or stand mid-leg deep, meditative, in the water. Large lizards abound on the banks, and snakes too, it may be, but they have the grace to keep out of sight, along with the jaguars and other unpleasant occupants of the Guiana jungle. In their stead light corials, sometimes with only a woman to paddle, sometimes a man or boy, dart out of the harbour-like shelter of the creeks; bush-negro families peer curiously from the doors of their floating cottages, or guide their timber-rafts down the stream. Ever and anon a white painted barque, conveying an overseer, a book-keeper, or some other of the white or semi-white gentry, rows quickly by, for the river is the highway, and the wayfarers along it many: so that even where its banks are at the loneliest, the stream itself has life and activity enough to show. More often, however, it passes between cultivated lands: for while the factories and sugar estates diminish in number as we go further up, the small Creole properties increase; and comfortable little dwellings, places, cottages, sheds, and out-houses, amid every variety of "provision ground" cultivation, multiply along the bank. Here, too, even more than along the Commeweyne, men in every variety of costume—from the raggedest half-nakodness that in this climate betokens, not exactly want, but rather hard out-door work, to the white trousers and black coat, the badges of the upper-class negro Creole—and a yet greater number of women, who have fortunately not learned to exchange the becoming and practical turban of their race for the ridiculous hat and bonnet

of European fashion, come down to honour the Governor's passage; nor does the blazing afternoon sun, now at his hottest, seem to have the least effect on the energy of their welcome. And I may add that not here only, and in the more secluded districts of the colony, but throughout its entire extent, I neither saw nor heard of anything indicating, however remotely, the duality of feeling that in so many other West Indian settlements—the Danish most—draws a line of separation, if not hostility, between the black and the white inhabitants of the land. The Creoles of Surinam are not less loyal to the Dutch tricolor than the burghers of Leyden, and King William himself could hardly expect a more affectionately enthusiastic greeting, were he to make a tour through the seven Provinces, than his representative receives when visiting his Transatlantic subjects of the same race. And in this matter, observation is confirmed by history; nor since the conclusion, in 1777, of the long and bloody Maroon wars, has a single outbreak or show of insubordination disturbed the interior harmony of Dutch Guiana.

For this happy state of things, contrasting so advantageously with the records of too many other neighbouring colonies, the wise and kindly rule of an enlightened Government has been, of course, the principal promoter and cause. But no small share of the praise is also due to the truest friends and best guides Europe has ever supplied to the African race, the Moravian brothers. More fortunate than their compeers of Jamaica and its sister-islands, the Surinam slaves fell to the share of these Moravian teachers, who had already as far back as 1735 organized settlements among the Indians of the interior with much labour and little result. It is remarkable that almost the only teachers who have met with any success—and indeed their success, so to call it, has been considerable, among the Indians of the two Continents south and north—are Roman Catholic priests. A sensuous idolatry best fits a sensuous good-for-nothing race. Whereas when a Catholic missionary suggested to a bush-negro the other day the propriety of exchanging his hereditary worship of the cotton-tree for that of an imaged Virgin Mary, the black is reported to have answered, "God made our idol, man made yours; and, besides, ours is the finer of the two," and accordingly declined the exchange. "*Se non è vero, è ben trovato.*"

But to return to the Moravians. When, after some difficulty, though less than might have been anticipated from the nature of things, on the masters' part, they were allowed to turn their attention to the slaves, their success was as rapid as it was well-deserved. In 1776 the first negro was baptized and admitted as a member of the congregation, and the countenance publicly and generously given on the occasion by the Governor of the colony

marked this step with the importance of a historical event. The very same year a Moravian teaching establishment was opened on one of the Commeweyne estates, others followed, and long before the emancipation of 1863, three-fourths of the working negroes had been numbered in the Moravian ranks. The latest census gives nineteen Moravian schools, attended by more than two thousand two hundred children, while over twenty-four thousand names, all Creole, are inscribed in the register of the Herrnhut brotherhood.

That the emancipation, too long deferred, of 1863, was neither preceded, accompanied, nor followed in Dutch Guiana by any disturbances like those which agitated Jamaica, Demerara, and other settlements thirty years before; that apprenticeship, so signal a failure elsewhere, here proved a success; that when this too came to its appointed end in 1873, scarce one among the thousand of Creole labourers on the estates struck work, or took advantage of his new completeness of freedom to give himself up to idleness and vagabond life—these things are mainly due, so the colonists acknowledge, to the spirit of subordination, industry, and order inspired in their pupils by the Moravian teachers. Alike untinctured by Baptist restlessness and Methodist fanaticism, their loyalty and good sense had prepared a people worthy of the rights into the enjoyment of which they at last entered; they had made of the slaves under their tutorial care, not only, as the phrase goes, good Christians, but they had also made of them what the majority of other teachers had failed to do, good citizens and good subjects; loyal to their government, respectful to their superiors, orderly among themselves. Obeah and poisoning, serious crimes indeed in any form, are almost unknown in Dutch Guiana; camp-meetings and the disgraceful extravagances of “native Baptist” preachers, mountebanks, and demagogues entirely so.

Liberty of conscience and the freedom of every man to choose and follow whatever religion he will, are very good things; yet even their warmest supporter would hardly hesitate to bring up his children by preference in that form of religion to which he himself belongs. Negroes in their present phase are children; when newly emancipated they might have been more properly termed babies; and there would certainly have been then no harm, nor even much difficulty, in prescribing for them some one of the many modes of Christianity best adapted to their comprehension and capabilities. And of all modes the Moravian, with its simple creed, simple though emotional worship, strict discipline, and absence of priestly caste-ship, would I venture to think have been the best.

These reflections, which, so far as they are merely reflections, the reader-companion of my trip is free to adopt or reject as he pleases, have in this my narrative derived their origin from the sight of the barn-like buildings of the Moravian establishment called of Char-

lottenburg alongside of which we are now borne on the clear black depths of the Cottica. The high-roofed conventual-looking mansion occupied by teachers themselves has a somewhat German air; the chapel, school-house, and cattle-sheds, from which last, with garden cultivation and farming work on a small scale, the mission is chiefly supported, are all spacious and all plain even to ugliness. If we enter the buildings, we shall see little more, or in truth nothing whatever, to gratify the artistic sense. Within as without, any approach to ornamentation, not decorative only, but architectural even, is strictly excluded; though whether for reasons of economy or on some abstract principle, I do not know. Perhaps it is a speculative craze, for why should not the Moravians have crazes of their own like other denominations? However, as this fancy, if fancy it be, does not interfere with the practical utility of the constructions, which are cool, roomy, well-aired, and well-kept, want of beauty may be pardoned though deplored. The interior arrangements, too, offer nothing to make a description interesting. A school-room, an elementary one especially, is much the same all the world over, whether the scholars be black or white; and the same may be said of a meeting-house and its contents. But as I have already said, they answer the purposes they were intended for, and in addition they really come up to the popular idea. Private dwellings, by African rule of taste, should be small, mere sleeping-coverts in fact, with an open verandah or shed tacked on, it may be, but as little construction as possible. Public buildings, on the contrary, cannot be too large. For decoration, the African eye has no great discernment; it appreciates bright colours and their combinations, but that is nearly all. In form, imitative form especially, they are at the very first letter of the art alphabet; nor were the most gifted of their kind, the ancient Egyptians, much further advanced in either respect. What then can be expected from the West Coast national type? But like the princes of their brotherhood, the light-coloured Africans of the Nile valley, the Congo negro, and the naturalised South-American Creole, understand the value of size in architecture as well as Mr. Fergusson himself, though not equally able perhaps to give the reason of the value; and the spacious assembly-room and wide enclosure of a central African palace, or a Surinam negro meeting-place, are the legitimate though somewhat feeble and degenerate descendants of the giant structures of Carnac.

Cottages and gardens extend far away to the right and left of the open space where stands the central establishment; cocoa-nut trees form a conspicuous and a very agreeable figure in the general landscape. Sir Charles Dilke asserts, correctly, I take for granted, that two hundred thousand acres of Ceylon land are shaded by cocoa-

palms, yielding from seven to eight hundred million cocoa-nuts a year, and worth two millions sterling. Amen. There is no reason, or, to put it better, no hindrance, either of climate or soil, to prevent the mainland Dutch settlement of the West from rivalling or excelling in this respect the once Dutch island of the East. Nor is much labour, nor much expense, beyond the first outlay of planting, required. Yet even for these, men and capital are alike wanting. Well, everything has its day; and Surinam, when her time comes, may be the garden of Guiana; she is, for nineteenth-tieths of her extent, more like the shrubbery now.

Meanwhile the current and the boat are bearing us on round another curve of the bank; the glittering plantain-screen and the infinite interlacings of the cocoa-leaves have closed round the green gap with its long-roofed dwellings; last of all, the small painted belfry has, so to speak, been swallowed up among the boughs, and "all the landscape is remade." Here is a remarkably large and handsome residence, with an avenue down to the water's edge, and landing-place to match; the garden, too, and the statues amid its flowers, look more numerous and more fantastic than common; the factory is in good working order; the sheds full of megass, the out-houses stocked—everything betokens a prosperous condition; the negroes at the wharf salute us with flags, popguns, and what they are pleased to call singing, as we approach. I inquire the name of the place; it is Munnikendam, the Governor informs me; adding that the estate is remarkable for the conservative tenacity with which, amid all the changes that have from time to time come over the spirit of the colonial dream, it has maintained old customs, old feelings, old manners and modes of life. Certainly we are now in what may be termed an out-of-the-way corner, not far from the very extreme limits of European habitation, and central influences may have been slow in diffusing themselves by Dutch barges up this secluded winding river. Nevertheless, to my English eye, the busiest districts of the colony, and the capital itself, had already appeared remarkably conservative. Not wholly stationary, for progress there certainly is; but it is progress by line and rule, precept and measure, here a little and there a little; not on the sweeping scale, or by the rapid transitions ordinary in the empirical regions of the New World. So that, thought I, if Paramaribo be comparatively not conservative, the conservatism of Munnikendam must be something worth the studying. The Governor assented, and by his order a message was shouted across the stream that on our return we would pay the good folks of the estate a visit, and we continued our way.

My readers will, I hope, accompany us on our visit to Munnikendam, in the following chapter, and derive from it as much pleasure in idea as we ourselves did in actual fact. Just now,

however, the immediate goal to which we were bound was the estate entitled "La Paix," the remotest of all European settlements, or farms, from the colonial centre, bordering on what was once the military frontier, between which and the Marowynne River the land lies yet open and unreclaimed. East of the Marowynne commences Surinam's old rival and plunderer—French Cayenne. The distance of La Paix from the capital, in a straight line, is about fifty miles; following the river windings, it cannot be much short of a hundred.

The Cottica in this part of its course, and above its junction with the Perica, which flows into it a little below Munnikendam, is narrow, often not exceeding eighty yards in width, but extremely deep; the banks, where they have not been cleared for cultivation, or planted over with fruit-trees, are a tangled maze of forest, under-wood, creeper, leaf, flower, thorn, through which a cat or a snake could hardly find a way. Coffee-bushes, the abandoned relics of plantation, mingle freely with the native growth; tall palms shoot up everywhere; bamboo tufts bend gracefully over the stream; water-lilies, pink, white, and yellow, float on the ink-black waters. From space to space the opening of some small natural creek, or artificial canal, enlarges the vista, green and flower-starred, to its furthest reach. Amid these, Creole cottages and gardens, cocoa-nut and banana plantations, abound and prosper; there is no sign of insecurity anywhere, still less of want. A mile or so before we reach La Paix, we pass the large dwelling-house called "Groot Marseille;" it is inhabited by three Creole negroes, the joint proprietors of the adjoining sugar estate. And these land-owning brethren, though thriving, live together, strange to say, in unity.

La Paix itself, with its seventeen hundred and sixty acres of grant, though not more than one-third of them are under actual cultivation, is a fine sugar estate; the fertility of the soil is evidently only limited by the amount of labour bestowed on it; and the employment of Coolies speaks well for the corresponding amount of capital invested. Yet the place has a half wild, frontier look; and in the struggle between the industry of man, and the excessive productiveness of nature, the latter seems over and anon almost on the point of gaining the upper hand. Long grass and fantastic undergrowth shoot up wherever the smallest vacancy is left; the cane-patch shows like a little island, surrounded by an encroaching tide of trees; and the tall branches overshadowing cottage and outhouse, give the habitations a backwood settlement appearance—doubtful and undecided.

And here, on the twilight verge, where the extremest rays of civilisation blend with the dark margin of savage, or, at any rate, non-civilised existence beyond, let us pause awhile.

W. G. PALGRAVE.

## THE POSTULATES OF ENGLISH POLITICAL ECONOMY.

### No. I.

ADAM SMITH completed the *Wealth of Nations* in 1776, and our English political economy is therefore just a hundred years old. In that time it has had a wonderful effect. The life of almost everyone in England—perhaps of everyone—is different and better in consequence of it. The whole commercial policy of the country is not so much founded on it as instinct with it. Ideas which are paradoxes everywhere else in the world are accepted axioms here as results of it. No other form of political philosophy has ever had one thousandth part the influence on us; its teachings have settled down into the common sense of the nation, and have become irreversible.

We are too familiar with the good we have thus acquired to appreciate it properly. To do so we should see what our ancestors were taught. The best book on Political Economy published in England before that of Adam Smith is Sir James Stuart's *Inquiry*, a book full of acuteness, and written by a man of travel and cultivation. And its teaching is of this sort:—

“In all trade two things are to be considered in the commodity sold. The first is the matter; the second is the labour employed to render this matter useful.

“The matter exported from a country is what the country loses; the price of the labour exported is what it gains.

“If the value of the matter imported be greater than the value of what is exported the country gains. If a greater value of labour be imported than exported the country loses. Why? Because in the first case strangers must have paid *in matter* the surplus of labour exported; and in the second place because the strangers must have paid to strangers *in matter* the surplus of labour imported. It is therefore a general maxim to discourage the importation of work, and to encourage the exportation of it.”

It was in a world where *this* was believed that our present Political Economy began.

Abroad the influence of our English system has of course not been nearly so great as in England itself. But even there it has had an enormous effect. All the highest financial and commercial legislation of the Continent has been founded upon it. As curious a testimony perhaps as any to its power is to be found in the memoir of Mollien—the financial adviser of the first Napoleon, *le bon Mollien*, whom nothing would induce him to discard because his administration brought *frances*, whereas that of his more showy competitors might after all end in *ideas*.



"It was then," says Mollien, in giving an account of his youth, "that I read an English book of which the disciples whom M. Turgot had left spake with the greatest praise—the work of Adam Smith. I had especially remarked how warmly the venerable and judicious Malesherbes used to speak of it—this book so deprecated by all the men of the old routine who spoke of themselves so improperly as of the school of Colbert. They seemed to have persuaded themselves that the most important thing for our nation was that not one *sou* should ever leave France; that so long as this was so the kind and the amount of taxation, the rate of wages, the greater or less perfection of industrial arts, were things of complete indifference, provided always that one Frenchman gained what another Frenchman lost."

And he describes how the *Wealth of Nations* led him to abandon those absurdities and to substitute the views with which we are now so familiar, but on which the "good Mollien" dwells as on new paradoxes. In cases like this one instance is worth a hundred arguments. We see in a moment the sort of effect that our English Political Economy has had when we find it guiding the finance of Napoleon, who hated ideologues, and who did not love the English.

But notwithstanding these triumphs, the position of our Political Economy is not altogether satisfactory. It lies rather dead in the public mind. Not only it does not excite the same interest as formerly, but there is not exactly the same confidence in it. Younger men either do not study it, or do not feel that it comes home to them, and that it matches with their most living ideas. New sciences have come up in the last few years with new modes of investigation, and they want to know what is the relation of economical science, as their fathers held it, to these new thoughts and these new instruments. They ask, often hardly knowing it, will this "science," as it claims to be, harmonize with what we now know to be sciences, or bear to be tried as we now try sciences? And they are not sure of the answer.

Abroad, as is natural, the revolt is more avowed. Indeed, though the Political Economy of Adam Smith penetrated deep into the continent, what has been added in England since has never done so equally; though if our "science" is true, the newer work required a greater intellectual effort, and is far more complete as a scientific achievement than anything which Adam Smith did himself. Political Economy, as it was taught by Ricardo, has had in this respect much the same fate as another branch of English thought of the same age, with which it has many analogies—jurisprudence as it was taught by Austin and Bentham; it has remained insular. I do not mean that it was not often read and understood, of course it was so, though it was often misread and misunderstood. But it never at all reigned abroad as it reigns here; never was really fully accepted in other countries as it was here where it arose. And no theory, economical or political, can now be both insular and secure; foreign

thoughts come soon and trouble us; there will always be doubt here as to what is only believed here.

There are, no doubt, obvious reasons why English Political Economy should be thus unpopular out of England. It is known everywhere as the theory "of Free Trade," and out of England free trade is almost everywhere unpopular. Experience shows that no belief is so difficult to create, and no one so easy to disturb. The protectionist creed rises like a weed in every soil. "Why," M. Thiers was asked, "do you give these bounties to the French sugar refiners?" "I wish," replied he, "the tall chimneys to smoke." Every nation wishes prosperity for some conspicuous industry. At what cost to the consumer, by what hardship to less conspicuous industries, that prosperity is obtained, it does not care. Indeed, it hardly knows, it will never read, it will never apprehend the refined reasons which prove those evils and show how great they are; the visible picture of the smoking chimneys absorbs the whole mind. And, in many cases, the eagerness of England in the free-trade cause only does that cause harm. Foreigners say, "Your English traders are strong and rich; of course you wish to under-sell our traders, who are weak and poor. You have invented this Political Economy to enrich yourselves and ruin us; we will see that you shall not do so."

And that English political economy is more opposed to the action of government in all ways than most such theories, brings it no accession of popularity. All governments like to interfere; it elevates their position to make out that they can cure the evils of mankind. And all zealots wish they should interfere, for such zealots think they can and may convert the rulers and manipulate the state control: it is a distinct object to convert a definite man, and if he will not be convinced there is always a hope of his successor. But most zealots dislike to appeal to the mass of mankind; they know instinctively that it will be too opaque and impenetrable for them.

But I do not believe that these are the only reasons why our English political economy is not estimated at its value abroad. I believe that this arises from its special characteristic, from that which constitutes its peculiar value, and, paradoxical as it may seem, I also believe that this same characteristic is likewise the reason why it is often not thoroughly understood in England itself. The science of political economy as we have it in England may be defined as the science of business, as business is in large productive and trading communities. It is an analysis of that world so familiar to many Englishmen—the "great commerce" by which England has become rich. It assumes the principal facts which make that commerce possible, and as is the way of an abstract science it isolates and simplifies them; it detaches them from the confusion with which they

are mixed in fact. And it deals too with the men who carry on that commerce, and who make it possible. It assumes a sort of human nature such as we see it everywhere around us, and again it simplifies that human nature; it looks at one part of it only. Dealing with matters of "business," it assumes that man is actuated only by motives of business. It assumes that every man who makes anything, makes it for money, that he always makes that which brings him in most at least cost, and that he will make it in the way that will produce most and spend least; it assumes that every man who buys, buys with his whole heart, and that he who sells, sells with his whole heart, each wanting to gain all possible advantage. Of course we know that this is not so, that men are not like this; but we assume it for simplicity's sake, as an hypothesis. And this deceives many excellent people, for from deficient education they have very indistinct ideas what an abstract science is.

More competent persons, indeed, have understood that English political economists are not speaking of real men, but of imaginary ones; not of men as we see them, but of men as it is convenient to us to suppose they are. But even they often do not understand that the world which our political economists treat of is a very limited and peculiar world also. They often imagine that what they read is applicable to all states of society, and to all equally, whereas it is only true of—and only proved as to—states of society in which commerce has largely developed, and where it has taken the form of development, or something near the form, which it has taken in England.

This explains why abroad the science has not been well understood. Commerce, as we have it in England, is not so full-grown anywhere else as it is here—at any rate, is not so out of the lands populated by the Anglo-Saxon race. Here it is not only a thing definite and observable, but about the most definite thing we have, the thing which it is most difficult to help seeing. But on the continent, though there is much that is like it, and though that much is daily growing more, there is nowhere the same pervading entity—the same patent, pressing, and unmistakable object.

And this brings out too the inherent difficulty of the subject—a difficulty which no other science, I think, presents in equal magnitude. Years ago I heard Mr. Cobden say at a League Meeting that "Political Economy was the highest study of the human mind, for that the physical sciences required by no means so hard an effort." An orator cannot be expected to be exactly precise, and of course political economy is in no sense the highest study of mind—there are others which are much higher, for they are concerned with things much nobler than wealth or money; nor is it true that the effort of mind which political economy requires is nearly as great as that

required for the abstruser theories of physical science, for the theory of gravitation, or the theory of natural selection; but, nevertheless, what Mr. Cobden meant had—as was usual with his first-hand mind—a great fund of truth. He meant that political economy—effectual political economy, political economy which in complex problems succeeds—is a very difficult thing; something altogether more abstruse and difficult, as well as more conclusive, than that which many of those who rush in upon it have a notion of. It is an abstract science which labours under a special hardship. Those who are conversant with its abstractions are usually without a true contact with its facts; those who are in contact with its facts have usually little sympathy with and little cognizance of its abstractions. Literary men who write about it are constantly using what a great teacher calls “unreal words”—that is, they are using expressions with which they have no complete vivid picture to correspond. They are like physiologists who have never dissected; like astronomers who have never seen the stars; and, in consequence, just when they seem to be reasoning at their best, their knowledge of the facts falls short. Their primitive picture fails them, and their deduction altogether misses the mark—sometimes, indeed, goes astray so far, that those who live and move among the facts, boldly say that they cannot comprehend “how any one can talk such nonsense.” While, on the other hand, these people who live and move among the facts often, or mostly, cannot of themselves put together any precise reasonings about them. Men of business have a solid judgment—a wonderful guessing power of what is going to happen—each in his own trade; but they have never practised themselves in reasoning out their judgments and in supporting their guesses by argument; probably if they did so some of the finer and correcter parts of their anticipations would vanish. They are like the sensible lady to whom Coleridge said, “Madam, I accept your conclusion, but you must let me find the logic for it.” Men of business can no more put into words much of what guides their life than they could tell another person how to speak their language. And so the “theory of business” leads a life of obstruction, because theorists do not see the business, and the men of business will not reason out the theories. Far from wondering that such a science is not completely perfect, we should rather wonder that it exists at all.

Something has been done to lessen the difficulty by statistics. These give tables of facts which help theoretical writers and keep them straight, but the cure is not complete. Writers without experience of trade are always fancying that these tables mean something more than, or something different from, that which they really mean. A table of prices, for example, seems an easy and

simple thing to understand, and a whole literature of statistics assumes that simplicity; but in fact there are many difficulties. At the outset there is a difference between the men of theory and the men of practice. Theorists take a table of prices as facts settled by unalterable laws; a stockbroker will tell you such prices can be "made." In actual business such is his constant expression. If you ask him what is the price of such a stock, he will say, if it be a stock at all out of the common, "I do not know, sir; I will go on to the market and get them to *make me a price*." And the following passage from the Report of the late Foreign Loans' Committee shows what sort of process "making" a price sometimes is:—

"Immediately," they say, "after the publication of the prospectus"—the case is that of the Honduras Loan—"and before any allotment was made, M. Lefevre authorised extensive purchases and sales of loans on his behalf, brokers were employed by him to deal in the manner best calculated to maintain the price of the stock; the brokers so employed instructed jobbers to purchase the stock when the market required to be strengthened, and to sell it if the market was sufficiently firm. In consequence of the market thus created dealings were carried on to a very large amount. Fifty or a hundred men were in the market dealing with each other and the brokers all round. One jobber had sold the loan (£2,500,000) once over."

Much money was thus abstracted from credulous rural investors; and I regret to say that book statisticians are often equally, though less hurtfully, deceived. They make tables in which artificial tables run side by side with natural ones; in which the price of an article like Honduras scrip, which can be indefinitely manipulated, is treated just like the price of Consols, which can scarcely be manipulated at all. In most cases it never occurs to the maker of the table that there could be such a thing as an artificial—a *mal à fide*—price at all. He imagines all prices to be equally straightforward.—Perhaps, however, this may be said to be an unfair sample of price difficulties, because it is drawn from the Stock Exchange, the most complex market for prices;—and no doubt the Stock Exchange has its peculiar difficulties, of which I certainly shall not speak lightly;—but on the other hand, in one cardinal respect, it is the simplest of markets. There is no question in it of the physical quality of commodities: one Turkish bond of 1858 is as good or bad as another; one ordinary share in a railway exactly the same as any other ordinary share; but in other markets each sample differs in quality, and it is a learning in each market to judge of qualities, so many are they, and so fine their gradations. Yet mere tables do not tell this, and cannot tell it. Accordingly in a hundred cases you may see "prices" compared as if they were prices the same thing, when in fact they are prices of different things. The *Gazette* average of corn is thus compared incessantly, yet it is hardly the price of the same exact quality of corn in any two years.

It is an average of all the prices in all the sales in all the markets. But this year the kind of corn mostly sold may be very superior, and last year very inferior—yet the tables compare the two without noticing the difficulty. And when the range of prices runs over many years, the figures are even more treacherous, for the names remain, while the quality, the thing signified, is changed. And of this persons not engaged in business have no warning. Statistical tables, even those which are most elaborate and careful, are not substitutes for an actual cognizance of the facts: they do not, as a rule, convey a just idea of the movements of a trade to persons not *in* the trade.

It will be asked, why do you frame such a science if from its nature it is so difficult to frame it? The answer is that it is necessary to frame it, or we must go without important knowledge. The facts of commerce, especially of the great commerce, are very complex. Some of the most important are not on the surface; some of those most likely to confuse *are* on the surface. If you attempt to solve such problems without some apparatus of method, you are as sure to fail as if you try to take a modern military fortress—a Metz or a Belfort—by common assault; you must have guns to attack the one, and method to attack the other.

The way to be sure of this is to take a few new problems, such as are for ever presented by investigation and life, and to see what by mere common sense we can make of them. For example, it is said that the general productiveness of the earth is less or more in certain regular cycles, corresponding with perceived changes in the state of the sun,—what would be the effect of this cyclical variation in the efficiency of industry upon commerce? Some hold, and as I think hold justly, that, extraordinary as it may seem, these regular changes in the sun have much to do with the regular recurrence of difficult times in the money market. What common sense would be able to answer these questions? Yet we may be sure that if there be a periodical series of changes in the yielding power of this planet, that series will have many consequences on the industry of men, whether those which have been suggested or others.

Or to take an easier case, who can tell without instruction what is likely to be the effect of the new loans of England to foreign nations? We press upon half-finished and half-civilised communities incalculable sums; we are to them what the London money-dealers are to students at Oxford and Cambridge. We enable these communities to read in every newspaper that they can have ready money, almost of any amount, on “personal security.” No incipient and no arrested civilizations ever had this facility before. What will be the effect on such civilizations now, no untutored mind can say.

Or again: since the Franco-German War an immense sum of new money has come to England; England has become the settling-place of international bargains much more than it was before; but whose mind could divine the effect of such a change as this, except it had a professed science to help it?

There are indeed two suggested modes of investigation, besides our English Political Economy, and competing with it. One is the Enumerative, or, if I may coin such a word, the "All-case method." One school of theorists say, or assume oftener than they say, that you should have a "complete experience;" that you should accumulate all the facts of these subjects before you begin to reason. A very able German writer has said, in this very Review,<sup>1</sup> of a great economical topic, banking,—

"I venture to suggest that there is but one way of arriving at such knowledge and truth" (that is absolute truth and full knowledge), "namely, a thorough investigation of the facts of the case. By the facts, I mean not merely such facts as present themselves to so-called practical men in the common routine of business, but the facts which a complete historical and statistical inquiry would develop. When such a work shall have been accomplished, German economists may boast of having restored the principles of banking, that is to say, of German banking, but not even then of banking in general. To set forth principles of banking in general, it will be necessary to master in the same way the facts of English, Scotch, French, and American banking, in short, every country where banking exists. The only" he afterwards continues, "but let us add also, the safe ground of hope for political economy is, following Bacon's exhortation to recommence afresh the whole work of economic inquiry. In what condition would chemistry, physics, geology, zoology be, and the other branches of natural science which have yielded such prodigious results, if their students had been linked to their chains of deduction from the assumptions and speculations of the last century."

But the reply is that the method which Mr. Cohn suggests was tried in physical science and failed. And it is very remarkable that he should not have remembered it as he speaks of Lord Bacon, for the method which he suggests is exactly that which Lord Bacon himself followed, and owing to the mistaken nature of which he discovered nothing. The investigation into the nature of heat in the *Norum Organum* is exactly such a collection of facts as Mr. Cohn suggests,—but nothing comes of it. As Mr. Jevons well says, "Lord Bacon's notion of scientific method was that of a kind of scientific book-keeping. Facts were to be indiscriminately gathered from every source, and posted in a kind of ledger from which would emerge in time a clear balance of truth. It is difficult to imagine a less likely way of arriving at discoveries." And yet it is precisely that from which, mentioning Bacon's name, but not forewarned by his experience, Mr. Cohn hopes to make them.

The real plan that has answered in physical science is much simpler. The discovery of a law of nature is very like the discovery

(1) *Fortnightly Review* for September, 1873.

of a murder. In the one case you arrest a suspected person, and in the other you isolate a suspected cause. When Newton, by the fall of the apple, or something else, was led to think that the attraction of gravitation would account for the planetary motions, he took that cause by itself, traced out its effects by abstract mathematics, and so to say found it "guilty,"—he discovered that it would produce the phenomenon under investigation. In the same way Geology has been revolutionized in our own time by Sir Charles Lyell. He for the first time considered the effects of one particular set of causes by themselves. He showed how large a body of facts could be explained on the hypothesis "that the forces now operating upon and beneath the earth's surface are the same both in kind and degree as those which, at remote epochs, have worked out geological changes." He did not wait to begin his inquiry till his data about all kinds of strata, or even about any particular kind, were complete; he took palpable causes as he knew them, and showed how many facts they would explain; he spent a long and most important life in fitting new facts into an abstract and youthful speculation. Just so in an instance which has made a literature and gone the round of the world. Mr. Darwin, who is a disciple of Lyell, has shown how one *vera causa*, "natural selection," would account for an immense number of the facts of nature; for how many, no doubt, is controverted, but, as is admitted, for a very large number. And this he showed by very difficult pieces of reasoning which very few persons would have thought of, and which most people found at first not at all easy to comprehend. The process by which physical science has become what it is, has not been that of discarding abstract speculations, but of working out abstract speculations. The most important known laws of nature—the laws of motion—the basis of the figures in the Nautical Almanack by which every ship sails,—are difficult and abstract enough, as most of us found to our cost in our youth.

There is no doubt a strong tendency to revolt against abstract reasoning. Human nature has a strong "factish" element in it. The reasonings of the *Principia* are now accepted. But in the beginning they were "mere crotchets of Mr. Newton's;" Flamsteed, the greatest astronomical discoverer of his day—the man of facts, *par excellence*—so called them; they have irresistibly conquered, but at first even those most conversant with the matter did not believe them.—I do not claim for the conclusions of English Political Economy the same certainty as for the "laws of motion." But I say that the method by which they have been obtained is the same, and that the difference in the success of the two investigations largely comes from this—that the laws of wealth are the laws of a most complex phenomenon which you can but passively observe, and



on which you cannot try experiments for science' sake, and that the laws of motion relate to a matter on which you can experiment, and which is comparatively simple in itself.

And to carry the war into the enemy's country, I say also that the method proposed by Mr. Cohn, the "all case" method, is impossible. When I read the words "all the facts of English banking," I cannot but ask of what facts is Mr. Cohn thinking. Banking in England goes on growing, multiplying, and changing, as the English people itself goes on growing, multiplying, and changing. The facts of it are one thing to-day and another to-morrow; nor at any one moment does any one know them completely. Those who best know many of them will not tell them or hint at them; gradually and in the course of years they separately come to light, and by the time they do so, for the most part, another crop of unknown ones has accumulated. If we wait to reason till the "facts" are complete, we shall wait till the human race has expired. I think that Mr. Cohn and those that think with him are too "bookish" in this matter. They mean by having all the "facts" before them, having all the printed facts, all the statistical tables. But what has been said of Nature is true of Commerce. "Nature," says Sir Charles Lyell, "has made it no part of her concern to provide a record of her operations for the use of men;" nor does trade either—only the smallest of fractions of actual transactions is set down, so that investigation can use it. Literature has been called the "fragment of fragments," and in the same way statistics are the "scrap of scraps." In real life scarcely any one knows more than a small part of what his neighbour is doing, and he scarcely makes public any of that little, or of what he does himself. A complete record of commercial facts, or even of one kind of such facts, is the completest of dreams. You might as well hope for an entire record of human conversation.

There is also a second antagonistic method to that of English Political Economy, which, by contrast, I will call the "single case" method. It is said that you should analyse each group of facts separately—that you should take the panic of 1866 separately, and explain it; or, at any rate, the whole history of Lombard Street separately, and explain it. And this is very good and very important; but it is no substitute for a preliminary theory. You might as well try to substitute a corollary for the proposition on which it depends. The history of a panic is the history of a confused conflict of many causes; and unless you know what sort of effect each cause is likely to produce, you cannot explain any part of what happens. It is trying to explain the bursting of a boiler without knowing the theory of steam. Any history of similar phenomena like that of Lombard Street could not be usefully told, unless there was a

considerable accumulation of applicable doctrine before existing. You might as well try to write the "life" of a ship, making as you went along the theory of naval construction. Clumsy dissertations would run all over the narrative; and the result would be a perfect puzzle.

I have been careful not to use in this discussion of methods the phrase which is oftenest used, viz. the Historical method, because there is an excessive ambiguity in it. Sometimes it seems what I have called the Enumerative, or "all case" method; sometimes the "single case" method; a most confusing double meaning, for by the mixture of the two, the mind is prevented from seeing the defects of either. And sometimes it has other meanings, with which, as I shall show, I have no quarrel, but rather much sympathy. Rightly conceived, the Historical method is no rival to the abstract method rightly conceived. But I shall be able to explain this better and less tediously at the end of these papers than I can at the beginning.

This conclusion is confirmed by a curious circumstance. At the very moment that our Political Economy is objected to in some quarters as too abstract, in others an attempt is made to substitute for it one which is more abstract still. Mr. Jevons of Manchester, and M. Walras of Lausanne, without communication, and almost simultaneously, have worked out a "mathematical" theory of Political Economy;—and any one who thinks what is ordinarily taught in England objectionable, because it is too little concrete in its method, and looks too unlike life and business, had better try the new doctrine, which he will find to be much worse on these points than the old.

But I shall be asked, Do you then say that English Political Economy is perfect?—surely it is contrary to reason that so much difficulty should be felt in accepting a real science properly treated? At the first beginning no doubt there are difficulties in gaining a hearing for all sciences, but English Political Economy has long passed out of its first beginning? Surely, if there were not some intrinsic defect, it would have been firmly and coherently established, just as others are?

In this reasoning there is evident plausibility, and I answer that, in my judgment, there are three defects in the mode in which Political Economy has been treated in England, which have prevented people from seeing what it really is, and from prizing it at its proper value.

First. It has often been put forward, not as a theory of the principal causes affecting wealth in *certain* societies, but as a theory of the principal, sometimes even of all, the causes affecting wealth in *every* society. And this has occasioned many and strong doubts about it. Travellers fresh from the sight, and historians fresh from the study of peculiar and various states of society, look with dislike and disbelief

on a single set of abstract propositions which claims, as they think, to be applicable to all such societies, and to explain a most important part of most of them. I cannot here pause to say how far particular English economists have justified this accusation; I only say that, taking the whole body of them, there is much ground for it, and that in almost every one of them there is some ground. No doubt almost every one—every one of importance—has admitted that there is a “friction” in society which counteracts the effect of the causes they treat of. But in general they leave their readers with the idea that, after all, this friction is but subordinate; that probably in the course of years it may be neglected; and, at any rate, the causes assigned in the science of Political Economy, as they treat it, are the main and principal ones. Now I hold that these causes are only the main ones in a single kind of society—a society of grown-up competitive commerce, such as we have in England; that it is only in such societies that the other and counteracting forces can be set together under the minor head of “friction;” but that in other societies these other causes—in some cases one, and in some another—are the most effective ones, and that the greatest confusion arises if you try to fit on *un*-economical societies the theories only true of, and only proved as to, economical ones. In my judgment, we need not that the authority of our Political Economy should be impugned, but that it should be *minimized*; that we should realise distinctly where it is established and where not; that its sovereignty should be upheld, but its frontiers marked. And until this is done, I am sure that there will remain the same doubt and hesitation in many minds about the science that there is now.

Secondly, I think it in consequence of this defect of conception economists have been far more abstract, and in consequence much more dry, than they need have been. If they had distinctly set before themselves that they were dealing only with the causes of wealth in a single set of societies, they might have effectively pointed their doctrines with facts from those societies. But, so long as the vision of universal theory vaguely floated before them, they shrank from particular illustrations. Real societies are plainly so many and so unlike that an instance from one kind does not show that the same thing exists in other societies—it rather raises in the mind a presumption that it does not exist there; and therefore speculators aiming at an all-embracing doctrine refrain from telling cases, because those cases are apt to work in ways, and to raise up the image not only of the societies in which the tenet illustrated is true, but also of the opposite group in which it is false.

Thirdly, it is also in consequence, as I imagine, of this defective conception of their science, that English Economists have not been as fertile as they should have been in verifying it. They have

been too content to remain in the "abstract," and to shrink from concrete notions, because they could not but feel that much of the most obvious phenomena of many nations did not look much like their abstractions. Whereas in the societies with which the science is really concerned, an almost infinite harvest of verification was close at hand, ready to be gathered in; and because it has not been used, much confidence in the science has been lost, and it is thought "to be like the stars which give no good light because they are so high."

Of course this reasoning implies that the boundaries of this sort of Political Economy are arbitrary, and might be fixed here or there. But this is already implied when it is said that Political Economy is an abstract science. All abstractions are arbitrary; they are more or less convenient fictions made by the mind for its own purposes. An abstract idea means a concrete fact or set of facts *minus* something thrown away. The fact or set of facts were made by nature; but how much you will throw aside of them and how much you will keep for consideration you settle for yourself. There may be any number of political economies according as the subject is divided off in one way or in another, and in this way all may be useful if they do not interfere with one another or attempt to rule further than they are proved.

The particular political economy which I have been calling the English Political Economy, is that of which the first beginning was made by Adam Smith. But what he did was much like the rough view of the first traveller who discovers a country; he saw some great outlines well, but he mistook others and left out much. It was Ricardo who made the first map; who reduced the subjects into consecutive shape, and constructed what you can call a science. Few greater efforts of mind have been made, and not many have had greater fruits. From Ricardo the science passed to a whole set of minds—James Mill, Senior, Torrens, Macculloch, and others, who busied themselves with working out his ideas, with elaborating and with completing them. For five-and-twenty years the English world was full of such discussions. Then Mr. J. S. Mill—the Mr. Mill whom the present generation know so well, and who has had so much influence,—shaped with masterly literary skill the confused substance of those discussions into a compact whole. He did not add a great deal which was his own, and some of what is due to him does not seem to me of great value. But he pieced the subjects together, showed where what one of his predecessors had done had fitted on to that of another, and adjusted this science to other sciences according to the notions of that time. To many students his book is the Alpha and Omega of Political Economy; they know little of what was before, and imagine little which can come after in the way of improvement. But it is not given to any writer to occupy such a place. Mr. Mill would

have been the last to claim it for himself. He well knew that taking his own treatise as the standard, what he added to Political Economy was not a ninth of what was due to Ricardo, and that for much of what is new in his book he was rather the *Secrétaire de la Rédaction*, expressing and formulating the current views of a certain world, than producing by original thought from his own brain. And his remoteness from mercantile life, and I should say his enthusiastic character, eager after things far less sublunary than money, made him little likely to give finishing touches to a theory of "the great commerce." In fact he has not done so; much yet remains to be done in it as in all sciences. Mr. Mill, too, seems to me open to the charge of having widened the old Political Economy either too much or not enough. If it be, as I hold, a theory proved of and applicable to particular societies only, much of what is contained in Mr. Mill's book should not be there; if it is, on the contrary, a theory holding good for all societies, as far as they are concerned with wealth, much more ought to be there, and much which is should be guarded and limited. English Political Economy is not a finished and completed theory, but the first lines of a great analysis which has worked out much, but which still leaves much unsettled and unexplained.

There is nothing capricious, we should observe, in this conception of Political Economy, nor though it originated in England is there anything specially English in it. It is the theory of commerce, as commerce tends more and more to be when capital increases and competition grows. England was the first—or one of the first—countries to display these characteristics in such vigour and so isolated as to suggest a separate analysis of them, but as the world goes on, similar characteristics are being evolved in one society after another. A similar money-market, a similar competing trade based on large capital, gradually tends to arise in all countries. As "men of the world" are the same everywhere, so the great commerce is the same everywhere. Local peculiarities and ancient modifying circumstances fall away in both cases; and it is of this one and uniform commerce which grows daily, and which will grow, according to every probability, more and more, that English Political Economy aspires to be the explanation.

And our Political Economy does not profess to prove this growing world to be a good world—far less to be the best. Abroad the necessity of contesting socialism has made some writers use the conclusions brought out by our English science for that object. But the aim of that science is far more humble; it says these and these forces produce these and these effects, and there it stops. It does not profess to give a moral judgment on either; it leaves it for a higher science, and one yet more difficult, to pronounce what ought and what ought not to be.

The first thing to be done for English Political Economy, as I hold, is to put its aim right. So long as writers on it do not clearly see, and as readers do not at all see, the limits of what they are analysing, the result will not satisfy either. The science will continue to seem what to many minds it seems now, proved perhaps but proved *in nubibus*; true, no doubt, somehow and somewhere, but that somewhere a *terra incognita*, and that somehow an unknown quantity.—As a help in this matter I propose in the present series of papers to take the principal assumptions of Political Economy one by one, and to show, not exhaustively, for that would require a long work, but roughly, where each is true and where it is not. We shall then find that our Political Economy is not a questionable thing of unlimited extent, but a most certain and useful thing of limited extent. By marking the frontier of our property we shall learn its use, and we shall have a positive and reliable basis for estimating its value.

## 11.

The first assumption which I shall take is that which is perhaps oftener made in our economical reasonings than any other, namely, that labour (masculine labour, I mean) and capital circulate readily within the limits of a nation from employment to employment, leaving that in which the remuneration is smaller and going to that in which it is greater. No assumption can be better founded, as respects such a country as England, in such an economical state as our present one. A rise in the profits of capital, in any trade, brings more capital to it with us nowadays—I do not say quickly, for that would be too feeble a word, but almost instantaneously. If owing to a high price of corn, the corn trade on a sudden becomes more profitable than usual, the bill-cases of bill-brokers and bankers are in a few days stuffed with corn bills—that is to say the free capital of the country is by the lending capitalists, the bankers and bill-brokers, transmitted where it is most wanted. When the price of coal and iron rose rapidly a year or two since, so much capital was found to open new mines and to erect new furnaces that the profits of the coal and iron trades have not yet recovered it. In this case the influence of capital attracted by high profits was not only adequate, but much more than adequate: instead of reducing these profits only to an average level, it reduced them below that level; and this happens most commonly, for the speculative enterprise which brings in the new capital is a strong, eager, and rushing force, and rarely stops exactly where it should. Here and now a craving for capital in a trade is as almost sure to be followed by a plethora of it as winter to be followed by summer.—Labour does

not flow so quickly from pursuit to pursuit, for man is not so easily moved as money—but still it moves very quickly. Patent statistical facts show what we may call “the tides” of our people. Between the years shown by the last census, the years 1861 and 1871, the population of

The Northern counties increased 23 per cent.			
Yorkshire	“	19	“
North-western counties	“	15	“
London	“	16	“

While that of

The South-western counties only increased 2 per cent.			
Eastern	“	7	“
North Midland	“	9	“

—though the fertility of marriages is equal. The set of labour is steadily and rapidly from the counties where there is only agriculture and little to be made of new labour, towards those where there are many employments and where much is to be made of it.

No doubt there are, even at present in England, many limitations to this tendency, both of capital and of labour, which are of various degrees of importance, and which need to be considered for various purposes. There is a “friction,” but still it is only a “friction;” its resisting power is mostly defeated, and at a first view need not be regarded. But taking the world, present and past, as a whole, the exact contrary is true; in most ages and countries this tendency has been not victorious but defeated; in some cases it can scarcely be said even to have existed, much less to have conquered. If you take at random a country in history, the immense chances are that you will find this tendency either to be altogether coerced, or not at all to prevail as it does with us now. This primary assumption of our Political Economy is not true everywhere and always, but only in a few places and a few times.

The truth of it depends on the existence of conditions which, taken together, are rarely satisfied. Let us take labour first, as it is the oldest and simplest of the two. First there must be “employments” between which labour is to migrate; and this is not true at all of the primitive states of society. We are used to a society which abounds in felt wants that it can satisfy, and where there are settled combinations of men—trades as we call them—each solely occupied in satisfying some one of them. But in primitive times nothing at all like this exists. The conscious wants of men are few, the means of supplying them still fewer, and the whole society homogeneous—one man living much as another. Civilization is a shifting mixture of many colours, but barbarism was and is of a dull monotony, hardly varying even in shade.

A picture or two of savage tribes brings this home to the mind

better than abstract words. Let us hear Mr. Catlin's description of a favourite North American tribe, with which he means us to be much pleased :—

"The Mandans, like all other tribes, live lives of idleness and leisure, and of course devote a great deal of time to their amusements, of which they have a great variety. Of these dancing is one of the principal, and may be seen in a variety of forms; such as the buffalo dance, the boasting dance, the begging dance, the scalp-dance, and a dozen other dances, all of which have their peculiar characters and meanings and objects."

Then he describes the "starts and jumps" of these dances, and goes on :—

"Buffaloes, it is well known, are a sort of roaming creatures congregating occasionally in huge masses, and strolling away about the country from east to west or from north to south, or just where their whims or fancies may lead them; and the Mandans are sometimes by this means most unceremoniously left without anything to eat, and being a small tribe and unwilling to risk their lives by going far from home in the face of their more powerful enemies, are oftentimes left almost in a state of starvation. In any emergency of this kind every man musters and brings out of his lodge his mask (the skin of a buffalo's head with the horns on), which he is obliged to keep in readiness for this occasion; and then commences the buffalo dance of which I have spoken, which is held for the purpose of making 'buffalo come,' as they term it,—of inducing the buffalo herds to change the direction of their wanderings, and bend their course towards the Mandan village and graze about on the beautiful hills and bluffs in its vicinity, where the Mandans can shoot them down and cook them as they want them for food.

"For the most part of the year the young warriors and hunters by riding out a mile or two from the village can kill meat in abundance; and sometimes large herds of these animals may be seen grazing in full view of the village. There are other seasons also when the young men have ranged about the country, as far as they are willing to risk their lives on account of their enemies, without finding meat. This sad intelligence is brought back to the chiefs and doctors, who sit in solemn council and consult on the most expedient measures to be taken until they are sure to decide the old and only expedient 'which has never failed.' This is the buffalo dance, which is incessantly continued till 'buffalo come,' and which the whole village by relays of dancers keeps up in succession. And when the buffaloes are seen, there is a brisk preparation for the chase—a great hunt takes place. The choicest pieces of the carcase are sacrificed to the Great Spirit, and then a surfeit or a carouse. These dances have sometimes been continued for two or three weeks until the joyful moment when buffaloes made their appearance. And so they '*never fail*,' as the village thinks, to bring the buffaloes in."

Such is the mode of gaining the main source of existence, without which the tribe would starve. And as to the rest we are told—

"The principal occupations of the women in this village consist in procuring wood and water, in cooking, dressing robes and other skins, in drying meat and wild fruits, and raising maize."

In this attractive description there is hardly any mention of male labour at all; the men hunt, fight, and amuse themselves, and the women do all the rest.

And in the lowest form of savage life, in the stone age, the social structure must have been still more uniform, for there were still less



means to break or vary it. The number of things which can be made with a flint implement is much greater than one would have imagined, and savages made more things with it than any one would make now. Time is nothing in the savage state, and protracted labour, even with the worst instrument, achieves much, especially when there are no other means of achieving anything. But there is no formal division of employments—no cotton trade, no iron trade, no woollen trade. There are beginnings of a division, of course, but, as a rule, every one does what he can at every thing.

In much later times the same uniformity in the structure of society still continues. We all know from childhood how simple is the constitution of a pastoral society. As we see it in the Pentateuch it consists of one family, or a group of families, possessing flocks and herds, on which, and by which, they live. They have no competing employments; no alternative pursuits. What manufactures there are are domestic, are the work of women at all times, and of men, of certain men, at spare times. No circulation of labour is then conceivable, for there is no circle; there is no group of trades round which to go, for the whole of industry is one trade.

Many agricultural communities are exactly similar. The pastoral communities have left the life of movement, which is essential to a subsistence on flocks and herds, and have fixed themselves on the soil. But they have hardly done more than change one sort of uniformity for another. They have become peasant proprietors—combining into a village, and holding more or less their land in common, but having no pursuit worth mentioning, except tillage. The whole of their industrial energy—domestic clothes-making and similar things excepted—is absorbed in that.

No doubt in happy communities a division of labour very soon and very naturally arises, and at first sight we might expect that with it a circulation of labour would begin too. But an examination of primitive society does not confirm this idea; on the contrary, it shows that a main object of the social organization which then exists, is to impede or prevent that circulation. And upon a little thought the reason is evident. There is no paradox in the notion; early nations were not giving up an advantage which they might have had; the good which we enjoy from the circulation of labour was unattainable by them; all they could do was to provide a substitute for it—a means of enjoying the advantages of the division of labour without it,—and this they did. We must carry back our minds to the circumstances of primitive society before we can comprehend the difficulty under which they laboured, and see how entirely it differs from any which we have to meet now.

A free circulation of labour from employment to employment involves an incessant competition between man and man, which causes constant quarrels,—some of which, as we see in the daily transactions

of trades unions, easily run into violence ; and also a constant series of new bargains, one differing from another, some of which are sure to be broken, or said to be so, which makes disputes of another kind. The peace of society is exposed in early times to greater danger from this source than now, because the passions of men were then less under control than now. "In the simple and violent times," as they have been well called, "which we read of in our Bibles," people struck one another, and people killed one another, for very little matters as we should think them. And the most efficient counter-active machinery which now preserves that peace, then did not exist. We have now in the midst of us a formed, elaborate, strong government, which is incessantly laying down the best rules which it can find to prevent trouble under changing circumstances, and which constantly applies a sharp pervading force running through society to prevent and punish breaches of those rules. We are so familiar with the idea of a government inherently possessing and daily exercising both executive and legislative power, that we scarcely comprehend the possibility of a nation existing without them. But if we attend to the vivid picture given in the Book of Judges of an early stage in Hebrew society, we shall see that there was then absolutely no legislative power, and only a faint and intermittent executive power. The idea of law making, the idea of making new rules for new circumstances, would have been as incomprehensible to Gideon or Abimelech as the statutes at large to a child of three years old. They and their contemporaries thought that there was an unalterable law consecrated by religion and confirmed by custom which they had to obey, but they could not have conceived an alteration of it except as an act of wickedness—a worshipping of Baal. And the actual coercive power available for punishing breaches of it was always slight, and often broken. One "judge," or ruler, arises after another, sometimes in one tribe and place, and another in another, and exercises some kind of jurisdiction, but his power is always limited ; there is no organization for transmitting it, and often there is no such person—no king in Israel whatever.

The names and the details of this book may or may not be historical, but its spirit is certainly true. The peace of society then reposed on a confused sentiment, in which respect for law, as such—at least law in our usual modern sense—was an inconsiderable element, and of which the main components were a coercive sense of ingrained usage, which kept men from thinking what they had not before thought, and from doing what they had not before done ; a vague horror that something, they did not well know what, might happen if they did so ; a close religion which filled the air with deities who were known by inherited tradition, and who hated uninherited ways ; and a submission to local opinion inevitable when family and tribe were

the main props of life,—when there really was “no world without Verona’s walls,”—when every exile was an outcast, expelled from what was then most natural, and scarcely finding an alternative existence.

No doubt this sentiment was in all communities partially reinforced by police. Even at the time of the “Judges,” there were no doubt “local authorities,” as we should now say, who forcibly maintained some sort of order even when the central power was weakest. But the main support of these authorities was the established opinion; they had no military to call in, no exterior force to aid them; if the fixed sentiment of the community was not strong enough to aid them they collapsed and failed. But that fixed sentiment would have been at once weakened, if not destroyed, by a free circulation of labour, which is a spring of progress that is favourable to new ideas, that brings in new inventions, that prevents the son being where his father was, that interrupts the tradition of generations and breaks inherited feeling. Besides causing new sorts of quarrels by creating new circumstances and new occasions, this change of men from employment to employment decomposes their moral authority, which alone in this state of society can prevent quarrels or settle them. Accordingly, the most successful early societies have forbidden this ready change as much as possible, and have endeavoured as far as they could to obtain the advantages of the division of labour without it. Sir Henry Maine, to whom this subject so peculiarly belongs, and who has taught us so much more on it than any one else, shall describe the industrial expedients of primitive society as he has seen them still surviving in India :—

“There is,” he says, “yet another feature of the modern Indian cultivating group which connects them with primitive western communities of the same kind. I have several times spoken of them as organized and self-acting. They in fact include a nearly complete establishment of occupations and trades for enabling them to continue their collective life without assistance from any person or body external to them. Besides the headmen or council exercising quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative power, they contain a village police, now recognized and paid in certain provinces by the British Government. They include several families of hereditary traders; the blacksmith, the harness-maker, the shoemaker. The Brahmin is also found for the performance of ceremonies, and even the dancing-girl for attendance at festivities. There is invariably a village accountant, an important person among an unlettered population, so important indeed and so conspicuous, that according to reports current in India, the earliest English functionaries engaged in settlements of land were occasionally led by their assumption that there must be a single proprietor somewhere to mistake the accountant for the owner of the village, and to record him as such in the official register. But the person practising any one of these hereditary employments is really a servant of the community as well as one of its component members. He is sometimes paid by an allowance in grain, more generally by the allotment to his family of a piece of land in hereditary possession. Whatever else he may demand for the wares he produces is limited by a fixed price very rarely departed from.”

To no world could the free circulation of labour, as we have it in England, and as we assume it in our Political Economy, be more alien, and in none would it have been more incomprehensible. In this case as in many others, what seems in later times the most natural organization is really one most difficult to create, and it does not arise till after many organizations which seem to our notions more complex have preceded it and perished. The village association of India, as Sir Henry Maine describes it, seems a much more elaborate structure, a much more involved piece of workmanship, than a common English village where everyone chooses his own calling, and where there are no special rules for each person, and where a single law rules all. But in fact our organization is the more artificial because it presupposes the pervading intervention of an effectual government—the last triumph of civilisation, and one to which early times had nothing comparable. In expecting what we call simple things from early ages, we are in fact expecting them to draw a circle without compasses, to produce the results of civilisation when they have not attained civilisation.

One instance of this want of simplicity in early institutions, which has almost more than any other impaired the free transit of labour, is the complexity of the early forms of landholding. In a future page I hope to say something of the general effects of this complexity, and to compare it with the assumptions as to ownership in land made by Ricardo and others. I am here only concerned with it as affecting the movement of men, but in this respect its effect has been incalculable. As is now generally known, the earliest form of landowning was not individual holding, but tribal owning. In the old contracts of Englishmen with savages nothing was commoner than for the king or chief to sell tracts of land,—and the buyers could not comprehend that according to native notions he had no right to do so, that he could not make a title to it, and that according to those notions there was no one who could. Englishmen in all land dealings looked for some single owner, or at any rate some small number of owners, who had an exceptional right over particular pieces of land; they could not conceive the supposed ownership of a tribe, as in New Zealand, or of a village in India, over large tracts. Yet this joint-stock principle is that which has been by far the commonest in the world, and that which the world began with. And not without good reason. In the early ages of society, it would have been impossible to maintain the exclusive ownership of a few persons in what seems, at first sight, an equal gift to all—a thing to which every one has the same claim. There was then no distinct government apart from and above the tribe any more than among New Zealanders now. There was no compulsory agency which could create or preserve exclusive ownership of the land, even if it had

been wished. And of course it could not have been wished, for though experience has now conclusively shown that such exclusive ownership is desirable for and beneficial to the nation as a whole as well as to the individual owner, no theorist would have been bold enough to predict this beforehand. This monopoly is almost a paradox after experience, and it would have seemed monstrous folly before it. Indeed, the idea of a discussion of it is attributing to people in the year 1000 B.C. the notions of people in the year 1800 A.D. Common ownership was then irremediable and inevitable; no alternative for it was possible, or would then have been conceivable. But it is in its essence opposed to the ready circulation of labour. Few things fix a man so much as a share in a property which is fixed by nature, and common ownership, wherever it prevails, gives the mass of men such a share.

And there is another force of the same tendency which does not act so widely, but which when it does act is even stronger—in many cases is omnipotent. This is the disposition of many societies to crystallize themselves into *specialized groups*, which are definite units, each with a character of its own, and are more or less strictly hereditary. Sir Henry Maine has described to us how in an Indian village the blacksmith is hereditary, and the harness-maker, and the shoe-maker,—and this is natural, for every trade has its secrets, which make a kind of craft or “mystery” of it, and which must be learnt by transmission or not at all. The first and most efficient kind of apprenticeship is that by birth; the father teaches his son that by which he makes his living, almost without knowing it; the son picks up the skill which is in the air of the house, almost without feeling that he is doing so. Even now we see that there are city families, and university and legal families,—families where a special kind of taste and knowledge are passed on in each generation by tradition, and which in each have in that respect an advantage over others. In most ages most kinds of skilled labour have shown a disposition to intensify this advantage by combination—to form a bounded and exclusive society, guild, trades union, or whatever it may be called, which keeps or tries to keep in each case to itself the rich secret of the inherited art. And even when no pains are taken, each special occupation, after it gains a certain size, tends to form itself into a separate group. Each occupation has certain peculiar characteristics which help to success in it, and which, therefore, it fosters and develops; and in a subtle way these traits collect together and form a group-character analogous to a national character. The process of caste-making is often thought to be an old-world thing which came to an end when certain old castes were made and fixed before the dawn of history. But in fact the process has been actively at work in recent times, and has hardly yet died

out. Thus in Cashmere, where the division of castes is already minute, Mr. Drew tells us that of the Batals—a class at the very bottom of the scale, “whose trade it is to remove and skin carcasses, and to cure leather,”—he has heard “that there are two classes; so apt are communities in India to divide and to subdivide, to perpetuate differences, and to separate rather than amalgamate. The higher Batals follow the Mohammedan rules as to eating, and are allowed some fellowship with the other Mohammedans. The lower Batals eat carrion, and would not bear the name of Mohammedans in the mouths of others, though they might call themselves so.” Just so, Mr. Hunter says that “the Brahmans of Lower Bengal bore to the Brahmans of Oudh the same relation, that the landed gentry of Canada or Australia bears to the landed gentry of England. Each is an aristocracy, both claim the title of Esquire, but each is composed of elements whose social history is widely different, and the home aristocracy never regards the successful settlers as equal in rank. The Brahmans of the middle land went further; they declared the Brahmans of Lower Bengal inferior; not only in the social scale, but in religious capabilities. To this day many of the north country Brahmans do not eat with the Brahmans of the lower valley, and convicted felons from the north-west will suffer repeated floggings in jail for contumacy, rather than let rice cooked by a Bengal Brahman pass their lips.” Caste-making is not a rare act, but a constantly occurring act, when circumstances aid it, and when the human mind is predisposed to it.

One great aid to this process is the mutual animosity of the different groups. “What one nation hates,” said Napoleon, “is another nation;” just so, what one caste hates is another caste: the marked characteristics of each being different form a certain natural basis for mutual dislike. There is an intense disposition in the human mind—as you may see in any set of schoolboys—to hate what is unusual and strange in other people, and each caste supplies those adjoining it with a conspicuous supply of what is unusual. And this hatred again makes each caste more and more unlike the other, for every one wishes as much as possible to distinguish himself from the neighbouring hated castes by excelling in the peculiarities of his own caste, and by avoiding theirs.

In the ancient parts of the world these contrasts of group to group are more or less connected for the most part with contrasts of race. Very often the origin of the caste—the mental tendency which made its first members take to its special occupation—was some inborn peculiarity of race; and at other times, as successive waves of conquest passed over the country, each race of conquerors connected themselves most with, and at last fell into, the pre-existing kind of persons which they most resembled, and frequently

in so doing hardened into an absolute caste what was before a half-joined and incipient group.

Each conquest, too, tends to make a set of outcasts—generally from the worst part of the previous population—and these become “hewers of wood and drawers of water” to the conquerors; that is, they are an outlying and degraded race, which is not admitted to compete or mix with the others, and which becomes more degraded from feeling that it is thus inferior, and from being confined to the harder, baser, and less teaching occupations. And upon these unhappy groups the contempt and hatred of the higher ones tend to concentrate themselves, and, like most strong sentiments in the early world, they find for themselves a religious sanction. To many villages in India, Sir Henry Maine says, there are attached a class of “outsiders” who never enter the village, or only enter reserved portions of it, who are looked on as “essentially impure,” “whose very touch is avoided as contaminating.” These poor people are more or less thought to be “accursed;” to have some taint which shows that the gods hate them, and which justifies men in hating them too, and in refusing to mix with them.

The result of these causes is, that many ancient societies are complex pieces of patchwork—bits of contrasted human nature, put side by side. They have a variegated complexity, which modern civilised States mostly want. And there must clearly have been an advantage in this organization of labour—to speak of it in modern phrase—though it seems to us now so strange, or it would not have sprung up independently in many places and many ages, and have endured in many for long tracts of years. This advantage, as we have seen, was the gain of the division of labour without the competition which with us accompanies it, but which the structure of society was not then hard enough to bear.

No doubt we must not push too far this notion of the rigidity of caste. The system was too rigid to work without some safety-valves, and in every age and place where that system prevails, some have been provided. Thus in India we are told “a Brahmana unable to subsist by his duties may live by the duty of a soldier; if he cannot get a subsistence by either of these employments, he may apply to tillage and attendance on cattle, or gain a competence by traffic, avoiding certain commodities. A Ghatriya in distress may subsist by all these means, but he must not have recourse to the highest functions. A Vaisya unable to subsist by his own duties may descend to the servile acts of a Sudra; and a Sudra, not finding employment by waiting on men of the higher classes, may subsist by handicrafts; besides the particular occupations assigned to the mixed classes, they have the alternative of following that profession which regularly

belongs to the class from which they derive their origin on the mother's side;" and so on, without end.

And probably it is through these supplementary provisions, as I may call them, that the system of caste ultimately breaks down and disappears. It certainly disappeared in ancient Egypt when the compact Roman Government was strong enough to do without it, and when a change of religion had removed the sanctions which fixed and consecrated it. The process is most slow, as our experience in India proves. The saying that "*La providence a ses aises dans le temps*" has rarely elsewhere seemed so true. Still, the course is sure, and the caste system will in the end pass away, whenever an efficient substitute has been made for it, and the peace of industry secured without it.

But it would be a great mistake to believe that, whenever and wherever there is an efficient external government capable of enforcing the law, and of making the competitive migration of labour safe and possible, such migration of itself at once begins. There is in most cases a long and dreary economical interval to be passed first. In many countries, the beginning of such migration is for ages retarded by the want of another requisite—the want of external security. We have come in modern Europe to look on nations as if they were things indestructible—at least, on large nations. But this is a new idea, and even now it has to be taken with many qualifications. But in many periods of history it has not been true at all; the world was in such confusion, that it was almost an even chance whether nations should continue, or whether they should be conquered and destroyed. In such times the whole energy of the community must be concentrated on its own defence; all that interferes with it must be sacrificed, if it is to live. And the most efficient mode of defending it mostly is a feudal system; that is, a local militia based on the land, where each occupier of the soil has certain services to render, of which he cannot divest himself, and which he must stay on certain definite fields to perform when wanted. In consequence the races of men which were possessed of an organization easily adapting itself to the creation of such a militia, have had a striking tendency to prevail in the struggle of history. "The feudal system," says Sir George Campbell, on many accounts one of our most competent judges, "I believe to be no invention of the Middle Ages, but the almost necessary result of the hereditary character of the Indo-Germanic institutions, when the tribes take the position of dominant conquerors. They form in fact an hereditary army, with that gradation of fealty from the commander to the private soldier which is essential in military operations. Accordingly, we find that among all the tribes of Indo-Germanic blood which have conquered and ruled Indian provinces, the tendency is to establish a



feudal system extremely similar to that which prevailed in Europe. In Rajpootana the system is still in full force. The Mahrattas and Sikhs had both established a similar system. In my early days it existed in great perfection in some parts of the Bis-Sutlej States." And where the system is most developed, at the lowest point of the scale there is always an immovable class—serfs, *villeins regardant*, or what we choose to call them—who do not fight themselves, who perhaps are too abject in spirit, or perhaps are of too dubious fidelity to be let have arms, but who cultivate the ground for those who really fight. The soldier class, rooted to the land by martial tenure, has beneath it a non-soldier class even more rooted to the soil by the tenure of tilling it. I need not say how completely such a system of military defence, and such a system of cultivation, are opposed to the free transit of labour from employment to employment. Where these systems are perfectly developed, this transit is not so much impeded as prevented.

And there is a yet more pervading enemy of the free circulation of labour. This is slavery. We must remember that our modern notion that slavery is an exceptional institution, is itself an exceptional idea; it is the product of recent times and recent philosophies. No ancient philosopher, no primitive community, would have comprehended what we meant by it. That human beings are divided into strong and weak, higher and lower, or what is thought to be such; and that the weak and inferior ought to be made to serve the higher and better, whether they would wish to do so or not, are settled axioms of early thought. Whatever might be the origin and whatever might be the fate of other institutions, the ancient world did not doubt that slavery at all events existed "by the law of nature," and would last as long as men. And it interferes with the ready passage of labour from employment to employment in two ways. First it prevents what we call for this purpose "employments"—that is, markets where labour may be bought, mostly in order that the produce may be sold. Slavery on the contrary strengthens and extends domestic manufactures where the produce is never sold at all, where it is never intended to be so, but where each household by its own hands makes what it wants. In a slave-community so framed, not only is there little quick migration of free labour, but there are few fit places for it to migrate between; there are no centres for the purchase of much of it; society tends to be divided into self-sufficing groups, buying little from the exterior. And at a later stage of industrial progress slavery arrests the movement of free labour still more effectively by providing a substitute. It is then the slave labour which changes occupation, and not the free labour. Just as in the present day a capitalist who wants to execute any sort of work hires voluntary labour to do it, so

in a former stage of progress he would buy slaves in order to do it. He might not indeed be able to buy enough slaves—enough suitable slaves, that is, for his purpose. The organization of slavery has never been as effectual as our present classified system of free labour, and from intrinsic defects never can be. But it does develop earlier. Just when the system of free labour might develop if it were let alone, the imperfect substitute of slavery steps in and spoils it. When free labour still moves slowly and irregularly, and when frequent wars supply the slave-market with many prisoners, the slave-market is much the easiest resource of the capitalist. So it is when a good slave-trade keeps it well filled. The capitalist finds it better to buy than to hire, for there are in this condition of things comparatively many men to be bought and comparatively few to be hired. And the result takes unexpected directions. “What the printing-press is in modern times,” says a German writer, “that slavery was in ancient times.” And though this may be a little exaggerated, it is certain that in ancient Rome books were produced much cheaper and in much greater number than they were for hundreds of years afterwards. When there was a demand for a book, extra copying-slaves could be “turned on” to multiply it in a way which in later times, when slavery had ceased, was impossible, and which is only surpassed by the way in which additional compositors are applied to works in demand now. And political philosophers proposed to obtain revenue from this source, and to save taxation. “Suppose,” says Xenophon, “that the Athenian State should buy twelve thousand slaves, and should let them out to work in the mines at an obolus a head, and suppose that the whole amount annually thus received should be employed in the purchase of new slaves, who should again in the same way yield the same income, and so on successively; the state would then by these means in five or six years possess six thousand slaves,” which would yield a large income. The idea of a compound interest investment in men, though abhorrent to us, seemed most natural to Xenophon. And almost every page of the classics proves how completely the civilisation then existing was based on slavery in one or other of its forms—that of skilled labour (the father of Demosthenes owned thirty-three cutlers and twenty coachmakers) or unskilled, that might either be worked by the proprietor or let out, as he liked. Even if this system had only economical consequences, it must have prevented the beginning of freely moving labour, for it is much handier than such a system can be at its outset. And as we know, the system has moral effects working in the same way even more powerful, for it degrades labour by making it the slave-mark, and makes the free labourer—whether the *prolétaire* of

ancient cities, or the "mean white" of American plantations—one of the least respectable and the least workmanlike of mankind.

Happily this full-grown form of slavery is exceedingly frail. We have ourselves seen in America how completely it collapses at an extrinsic attack; how easy it is to destroy it, how impossible to revive it. And much of the weakness of ancient civilisation was also so caused. Any system which makes the mass of a society hate the constitution of that society, must be in unstable equilibrium. A small touch will overthrow it, and scarcely any human power will reestablish it. And this is the necessary effect of capitalistic slavery, for it prevents all other labourers, makes slaves the "many" of the community, and fills their minds with grief and hatred. Capitalistic slavery is, as history shows, one of the easiest things to efface, as domestic slavery is one of the hardest. But capitalistic slavery has vitally influenced most of the greatest civilisations; and as domestic slavery has influenced nearly all of them, the entire effect of the two has been prodigious.

We see then that there are at least four conditions to be satisfied before this axiom of our English Political Economy is true within a nation. Before labour can move easily and as it pleases from employment to employment there must be such employments for it to move between;—there must be an effectual Government capable of maintaining peace and order during the transition and not requiring itself to be supported by fixity of station in society as so many governments have been;—the nation must be capable of maintaining its independent existence against other nations without a military system dependent on localised and immovable persons; and there must be no competing system of involuntary labour limiting the number of employments or moving between them more perfectly than contemporary free labour. These are not indeed all the conditions needful for the truth of the axiom, but the others can be explained better when some other matters have been first discussed.

WALTER BAGEHOT.

## MODERN ENGLISH PROSE.

IN comparing for purposes of study the two great Histories of Greece which England produced in the last generation, a thought, which has most probably often presented itself to other students, has frequently occurred to me. Much as the two works differ in plan, in views, and in manner of execution, their difference has never struck me so much as in the point of style. And the remarkable feature of this difference is, that it is not by any means the natural variation which we allow for, and indeed expect, in the productions of any two men of decided and distinct literary ability. It is not as the difference between Hume and Gibbon, and the difference between Clarendon and Taylor. In the styles of these great writers, and in those of many others, there is the utmost conceivable diversity; but at the same time they are all styles. We can see (see it, indeed, so clearly that we hardly take the trouble to think about it) that each of them made a distinct effort to arrange his words into their clause, his clauses into their sentence, and his sentences into their paragraph according to certain forms, and that though these forms varied in the subtle and indescribable measure of the taste and idiosyncrasy of each writer, the effort was always present, and was only accidentally if inseparably connected with the intention to express certain thoughts, to describe certain facts, or to present certain characters. But when we come to compare Thirlwall with Grote, we find not a variation of the kind just mentioned, but the full opposition of the presence of style on the one hand and the absence of it on the other. The late Bishop of St. David's will probably never be cited among the greatest masters of English prose style, but still we can see without difficulty that he has inherited its traditions. It would be difficult, on the other hand, to persuade a careful critic that Grote ever thought of such things as the cadence of a sentence or the composition of a paragraph. That he took so much trouble as might suffice to make his meaning clear and his language energetic is obvious; that in no case did he think of looking beyond this is I think certain.

But the difference between these two great historians is very far from being a mere isolated fact, of little more interest or significance than a parallel between Macedon and Monmouth. It marks with extraordinary precision the date and nature of a change which has affected English literature to a degree and in a manner worthy of the most serious consideration. What this change is, and whether it amounts to an actual decay or to a mere temporary neglect of style in English prose writing, are questions which are certainly of importance, and the answers to which should not, as it seems to me, lack interest.

If, then, we take up almost any book of the last century, we shall find that within varying limits the effort of which I have just spoken is distinctly present. The model upon which the writer frames his style may be and probably is faulty in itself, and still more probably is faultily copied; there may be too much Addison in the mixture, or too much Johnson; but still we shall see that an honest attempt at style, an honest endeavour at manner as apart from matter, has been made, however clumsy the attempt may be, and however short of success it may fall. But if we take up any book of the last forty or fifty years, save a very few, the first thing that will strike us is the total absence of any attempt or endeavour of the kind. The matter will, as a rule, have been more or less carefully attended to, and will be presented to the reader with varying degrees of clearness and precision. But the manner, except in so far as certain peculiarities of manner may be conducive or prejudicial to clearness and precision of statement—sometimes perhaps to apparent precision with any sacrifice of clearness—will in most cases be found to have been totally neglected, if a thing may be said to be neglected which does not appear to have even presented itself within the circumference of the field of view. In other words, and to adopt a convenient distinction, though there may be a difference of manner, there is usually no difference of style, for there is no style at all.

Before going any further, it may be well to adopt a commendable, if antiquated and scholastic practice, and to set down accurately what is here meant by style, and of what it consists. Style is the choice and arrangement of language with only a subordinate regard to the meaning to be conveyed. Its parts are the choice of the actual words to be used, the further selection and juxtaposition of these words, the structure of the clauses into which they are wrought, the arrangement of the clauses into sentences, and the composition of the sentences into paragraphs. Beyond the paragraph style can hardly be said to go, but within that limit it is supreme. The faults incident to these parts (if I may be allowed still to be scholastic) are perhaps also worthy of notice. Every one can see, though every one is by no means careful to put his knowledge into practice, that certain words are bad of themselves, and certain others to be avoided wherever possible. The mere grammar of style teaches us not to say "commence" where we can say "begin," or "reliable" where we can say "trustworthy." The next stage introduces difficulties of a higher order, though these also are more or less elementary. Most people can see the faults in the following sentences:—

"Had he always written upon the level we behold here there could be little question that the author would have taken his place amongst the front rank of dramatists." Here "writing upon the level we behold here" is a combination of the most obviously incon-

gruous notions. Again, "They did reject him *of course*, but his speech remains as a model for all true men to follow, as a warning to all who may adopt another *course*," &c. Here the unintentional repetition of the word "course" in an entirely different sense within the compass of a couple of lines is unpardonable. But these are mere rudiments; it is in the breach or neglect of the rules that govern the structure of clauses, of sentences, and of paragraphs that the real secret of style consists, and to illustrate this breach or observation is less easy. The task will be perhaps made easier if we consider first in the rough how the prevalent English style of the present day differs from that of past times.

Some five-and-thirty years ago De Quincey had already noticed and deplored the deterioration of which we speak. In his *Essay on Style* (reprinted in the sixth volume of his collected works) he undertakes to discuss at some length the symptoms and causes of the disease. De Quincey, as any one who is at all acquainted with his works is aware, gave considerable attention to the subject of style, and professed to be no mean authority thereon. There were, indeed, two peculiarities about him which prevented him from deserving a very high place as a referee on such matters. The first was his mistaken idea that extremely ornate prose—the prose which his ally John Wilson called "numerous," and which others have called Asiatic—was the highest form attainable, and that any writer who did not aim at this fell naturally into a lower class. The other was his singular crotchettiness, which made him frequently refuse to see any good in the style of writers to whom, for some reason or for no reason, he had taken a dislike. It will probably be allowed, not merely by persons who hold traditional opinions, but by all independent students of literature, that we must look with considerable distrust on the dicta of a critic who finds fault with the styles of Plato and of Conyers Middleton. The *Essay on Style*, however (at least its first part, for the latter portions go off into endless digressions of no pertinence whatever), is much more carefully written and much more carefully reasoned than most of De Quincey's work. The purport of it is, that the decay of style is to be attributed partly to the influence of German literature, but chiefly to the prevalence of journalism. No one will deny that the influence of newspaper writing is in many ways bad, and that to it is due much of the decadence in style of which complaint is made. But either the prevalent manner of journalism has undergone a remarkable change during the past generation, or else the particular influence which De Quincey supposes it to have had was mistaken by him. I do not myself pretend to a very intimate acquaintance with the periodical literature of thirty or forty years ago, and I am afraid that not even in the pursuit of knowledge could I be tempted to plunge into such a dreary and unbuoyant *mare mortuum*. With respect to the papers

of to-day it is certainly not difficult to discern a peculiarity in their styles, or in what does duty for style in them. A large volume, for instance, might be profitably written, if, perhaps, not so profitably read, on the various stylistic peculiarities of the *Times*. There used to be the famous and memorable affectation of peculiar spelling, or what one might perhaps, after the story of King Sigismund, call the *super-orthographicam* style. Then, some ten years ago, there came the great "Queen of Sheba" style, which consisted in opening an article with some fact or allusion which had the remotest (or not the remotest) connection with the subject. Of late, perhaps, there has been less unity; but one style has never been lacking—a style which might be called the magisterial, but which I (having been once informed by a great master thereof, with whom I presumed to differ, that "all persons of common sense and morality" thought as he did) prefer to call the common-sense-and-morality style. This style is convenient for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness. If you approve, you can point out not too enthusiastically that the view or proceeding in question is the only one which common sense and morality allow; if (which is possible) you do not understand, common sense, by not understanding also, will help you out of the difficulty; and if you disapprove, morality will be as violently outraged as you like. Of the weekly papers, it is impossible not to admire the free-and-easy doctrinaire-ism of the *Spectator*, which is almost entirely an affair of style depending on a sedulous avoidance of ornate language, and a plentiful use of colloquial words and phrases about the least colloquial matters. Then there is the style of the *Saturday Review* in its political articles, a style which appears to be framed on the principle that thoughts and words economise weight by being meted out in small doses, and that a pound of buckshot will go farther than a pound of bullets. Lastly, the inquirer into such things will not neglect the peculiar aridity of certain of the older *Quarterlies*, which seem to have retained the ponderous clauses of other days, while neglecting the form which saved those clauses from being cumbrous. But in most of all this we shall find little to bear out De Quincey's verdict. Long and involved sentences, unduly stuffed with fact and meaning, are what he complains of; and though there is no doubt that we should not have to go far in order to find such at the present day, yet it does not appear, to me at least, that the main fault of contemporary English style is of this kind. On the contrary, the sin of which I should chiefly complain is the sin of over-short sentences, of mere gasps instead of balanced periods. Such a paragraph as the following will illustrate what I mean: "That request was obeyed by the massacre of six out of the surviving princes of the imperial family. Two alone escaped. With such a mingling of light and darkness did Constantine close his

career." I think that any one who considers this combination of two mutilated clauses with an interjectional copula, and who perceives with what ease its hideous cacophony might have been softened into a complete and harmonious sentence, must feel certain that its present form is to some extent intentional. The writer might very well have written: "That request was obeyed by the massacre of six out of the eight surviving princes of the imperial family, and the career of Constantine was closed in a mixture of light and darkness." Why did he not?

Again, let us take a book of recent date, whose style has received considerable praise both in England and abroad—Mr. Green's *Short History of the English People*. The character of Elizabeth is perhaps the most carefully written, certainly the most striking, passage in the book, and contains a most elaborate statement of that view of the great queen which many historical students now take. It enforces this view with the greatest energy, and sets it before us in every detail and difference of light and shade. But how inartistic it is! how thoroughly bad in conception, composition, and style! In the first place it occupies some seven printed pages of unusual extent and closeness, each of which is at least equal to two of the ordinary octavo pages of an English classic author. Let any one, if he can, imagine one of the great masters who could both draw and compose, Hume or Middleton, Clarendon or Swift, giving us a character of fourteen pages. A portrait on the scale of Brobdingnag, with all features and all defects unnaturally emphasized and enlarged, could hardly be more disgusting.<sup>1</sup>

It is not necessary to multiply examples, which if all the defects of contemporary style were to be noticed and illustrated, would occupy a space longer than the present article. In all but a very few writers we shall observe with certain variations the same defects—inordinate copiousness of treatment combined with an utter inability, or at best an extreme unwillingness, to frame a sentence of due proportion and careful structure. It should certainly be possible to trace the origin and examine the nature of a phenomenon so striking and so universal.

The secret of the manner will not long escape us if we notice or can disengage the intention with which, willingly or unwillingly, this manner has been adopted. Nor is this intention very hard to discover. It is, as it appears to me, a desire to present the subject,

(1) I cannot refrain from noticing an instance from this writer of the absurdity into which the passion for picturesque epithet betrays many contemporary authors. At Newbury, we are told, "the London train bands flung Rupert's horsemen *roughly* off their front of pikes." Here *roughly* is in the Polonian sense "good." Visions of the sturdy and pious citizen discomfiting the debauched cavalier are aroused. But let us consider it with the sobriety proper to history and to art, and perhaps we shall ask Mr. Green to show us how to fling an enemy *softly* off a pike. Roaring like a sucking-dove would be nothing to this gymnastic-effort.



whatever it may be, to the reader in the most striking and arresting fashion. The attention of the reading public generally has, from causes to be presently noticed, become gradually concentrated almost wholly upon subject-matter. Among what may be called, intellectually speaking, the lower classes, this concentration shows itself not in the preference but in the exclusive study of novels, newspapers, and sometimes of so-called books of information. A book must be as they say "about something," or it fails altogether to arrest their attention. To such persons a page with (as it has been quaintly put) no "resting-places," no proper names and capital letters to fix the eye, is an intolerable weariness, and to them it is evident that style can be only a name. Somewhat above them come the (intellectually) middle classes. They are not absolutely confined to personal adventure, real or fictitious, or to interesting facts. They can probably enjoy the better class of magazine articles, superior biographies, travels, and the other books that everybody reads and nobody buys. This class will even read poetry if the poet's name be known, and would consider it a grave affront if it were hinted to them that their appreciation of style is but dull and faulty. A certain amount of labour is therefore required on work which is to please these readers: labour, however, which is generally bestowed in a wrong direction, on ornament and trick rather than on really artistic construction and finish. Lastly there is the highest class of all, consisting of those who really possess, or might possess, taste, culture, and intellect. Of these the great majority are now somewhat alienated from pure literature, and devoted rather to social matters, to science, or to the more fashionable and profitable arts of design. Their demand for style in literature is confined chiefly to poetry. They also are interested more by their favourite subjects treated anyhow, than by subjects for which they care little treated well, so that even by them little encouragement is given to the cultivation and little hinderance to the decay of prose style.

Intimately connected with the influences that arise from this attitude and temper of the general reader, are certain influences which spring from such prevalent forms and subjects of literature as present themselves to the general writer. The first of these forms, and unquestionably the most constant and pervading in its influence, is now, as it was in De Quincey's days, journalism. No one with the slightest knowledge of the subject will pretend that the influence of journalism upon writing is wholly bad. Whatever may have been the case formerly, a standard of excellence which is in some respects really high is usually aimed at, and not seldom reached, in the better class of newspapers. Some appropriateness in the use of words, a rigid avoidance of the more glaring grammatical errors, and a respectable degree of clearness in statement, are expected by the reader and usually observed by the writer. In

these respects, therefore, there is no falling off to be complained of, but rather a marked improvement upon past times to be perceived. Yet, as regards the higher excellences of style, it is not possible that the influence of journalism should be good. For it must at any cost be rapid, and rapidity is absolutely incompatible with style. The journalist has as a rule one of two things to do; he has either to give a rapid account of certain facts, or to present a rapid discussion of certain arguments. In either case it becomes a matter of necessity for him to adopt stereotyped phrases and forms of speech which, being ready cut and dried, may abbreviate his labour and leave him as little as possible to invent in his limited time. Now there is nothing more fatal to the attainment of a good style than the habit of using such stereotyped phrases and forms. With the imperiousness natural to all art, style absolutely refuses to avail itself of, or to be found in company with, anything that is ready made. The rule must be a leaden one, the mould made for the occasion, and broken after it has passed. Every one who has ever seriously tried to write must be conscious how sorely he has been beset, and how often he has been overcome, by the almost insensible temptation to adopt the current phrases of the day. Bad, however, as the influence of journalism is in this respect, it is perhaps worse in its tendency to sacrifice everything to mere picturesqueness of style (for the word must be thus misused because there is no other). The journalist is bound to be picturesque by the law of his being. The old phrase, *seignius irritant*, is infinitely truer of pseudo-picturesque style as compared with literature which holds to its proper means of appeal, than it is of literal spectacle as compared with narrative. And the journalist is obliged at any cost *irritare animos*, and that in the least possible time.

This tendency of journalism is assisted and intensified by that of another current form of literature, novel-writing. A very little thought will show that if the novel-writer attains to style it is almost a marvel. Of the four constituent elements of the novel, plot, character, description, and dialogue, none lend themselves in any great degree to the cultivation of the higher forms of style, and some are distinctly opposed to it. The most cunning plot may be developed equally in the style of Plato and in the style of a penny dreadful. Character drawing, as the novelist understands or should understand it, is almost equally unconnected with style. On the other hand description and dialogue, unless managed with consummate skill, distinctly tend to develop and strengthen the crying faults of contemporary style, its picturesqueness at any cost, its gasping and ungraceful periods, its neglect of purely literary effect.

Lastly, there must be noticed the enormous influence necessarily exerted by the growth of what is called scientific study (to use the

term in its largest and widest sense), and by the displacement in its favour of many, if not most, of the departments of literature which were most favourable to the cultivation of style. In whatever quarter we look, we shall see that the primary effort of the writer and the primary desire of the reader are both directed to what are called scientific or positive results, in other words to matter instead of manner. In using the word science here, I have not the slightest intention of limiting its meaning, as it is too often limited, to physical science. I extend it to every subject which is capable of being treated in a scientific way. And I think we shall find that all subjects and all kinds of prose literature which are not capable of this sort of treatment, or do not readily lend themselves to it, are yearly occupying less and less the attention of both artists and audiences. Parliamentary oratory, which furnished a vigorous if a somewhat dangerous stimulant to the cultivation of style, is dead utterly. Pulpit eloquence, which at its worst maintained stylistic traditions, and at its best furnished some of the noblest examples of style, is dying, partly owing to the persistent refusal of the men of best culture and abilities to enter the clerical profession, partly to the absence of the serene security of a settled doctrine and position, but most of all to the demands upon the time of the clergy which modern notions enforce, and which make it utterly impossible for the greater number to devote a proper time to study. Philosophy, another great nurse of style, has now turned stepmother, and turns out her nurselings to wander in "thorniest queaches" of terminology and jargon, instead of the ordered gardens wherein Plato and Berkeley walked. History even, the last or almost the last refuge of a decent and comely prose, is more busy about records and manuscripts than about periods and paragraphs. Only criticism, the youngest and most hopeful birth of time as far as prose style is concerned, has not yet openly apostatized. It is true that even here signs of danger are not wanting, and that already we are told that criticism must be scientific, that its reading must not be desultory, and so forth. But on the whole there is little fear of relapse. The man who would cut himself a coat from another's cloth must bring to the task the knowledge and genius, the care and labour, of a skilled fashioner if he is to make good his claim of ownership. The man who has good work in perpetual contemplation is not likely to be satisfied with the complacent production of what is bad.

There is, moreover, one influence, or rather one set of influences, hostile to the attainment of style in the present day which I have as yet left unnoticed, and the approach to which is guarded by ground somewhat dangerous to the tread. It will, I think, appear to any one who contemplates the subject fully and impartially that style is essentially an aristocratic thing; and it is already a commonplace

to say that the spirit of to-day, or perhaps the spirit of the times immediately behind us, is essentially democratic. It is democratic not in any mere political sense, but in the intolerance with which it regards anything out of the reach of, or incomprehensible to, the ordinary Philistine, working by the methods of Philistia. Intellectual and artistic pre-eminence, except in so far as it ministers to the fancies of the vulgar (great or small), is perhaps especially the object of this intolerance. Every one has witnessed or shared the angry impatience with which the ordinary Briton resents anything esoteric, fastidious, or fine. And the charms of prose style especially merit these epithets, and are not to be read by any one who runs, or tasted by any one who swallows in haste. Gaudy ornament is intelligible, graphic drawing is intelligible; but the finer cadences of the period, the more intricate strokes of composition, fall unregarded on the common ear and pass unnoticed by the common eye. To be tickled, to be dazzled, to be harrowed, are impressions of which the uncultured man is capable; they require little intellectual effort, and scarcely any judgment or taste in the direction of that little. But the music of the spheres would form but a sorry attraction in a music-hall programme, and Christopher Sly is not willing to accept nectar in exchange for a pot of even the smallest ale. And if the angry resentment of not a few readers gives the votary of style but little chance of an audience, it must be admitted that the lack of what I have called an aristocratic spirit gives the audience little chance of a performer. The conditions of modern life are unfavourable to the attainment of the peculiar mood of somewhat arrogant indifference which is the characteristic of the scholar. Every one knows Dean Gaisford's three reasons for the cultivation of the Greek language; and I for my part have no doubt that one of them most accurately describes an important feature of the *Wesen des Gelehrten*. It may not be necessary for him "to read the words of Christ in the original;" it may not be of absolute importance that he should "have situations of affluence opened to him." But it certainly is essential that he should "look down on his fellow-creatures from a proper elevation;" and this is what the tendency of modern social progress is making more and more difficult, at any rate in appearance. You cannot raise the level of the valleys without diminishing the relative height of the hills; and you cannot scatter education and elementary cultivation broadcast without diminishing the value of the privileges which appertain to superior culture. The old republic of letters was, like other old republics, a democracy only in name, but in reality a more or less close oligarchy, looking down on metics and slaves whose degradations and disabilities heightened its courage and gave a zest to its freedom. In letters, as in politics, we are doing our best to change all this; and the possible result may be,

that every one will soon be able to write a *Daily Telegraph* article, and that no one will aspire to anything beyond.<sup>1</sup>

The general characteristics of style which the influence, combined or partial, of these forces has produced have been already indicated, but may perhaps now be summed up. Diffuseness; sacrifice of the graces of literary proportion to real or apparent clearness of statement; indulgence in cut-and-dried phrases; undue aiming at pictorial effect; gaudiness of unnatural ornament; preference of gross and glaring effects *en bloc* to careful composition. Certain authors who are either free from these defects or have vigour enough to excuse or transform them must now be noticed.

For reasons obvious, though various, it is not my intention to discuss in any way at the present time the style of the author of *Sartor Resartus*. Mr. Carlyle being thus removed, there can be little question who must take the foremost place in a discussion as to the merits and demerits of modern English prose style. And yet, audacious or paradoxical as the assertion may seem, it is at least doubtful whether in strictness we can assign to Mr. Ruskin a position in the very highest rank of writers if we are to adopt style as a criterion. The objection to his manner of writing is an obvious one, and one which he might very likely take as a compliment: it is too spontaneous in the first place, and too entirely subordinate to the subject in the second. I hope that it may be very clearly understood that I can see passages in *Modern Painters* and in the *Stones of Venice* (for I must be permitted to neglect the legions of little books with parody-provoking titles which have appeared in the last three lustres) which, for splendour of imaginative effect, for appropriateness of diction, for novelty and grandeur of conception, stand beyond all chance of successful rivalry, almost beyond all hope of decent parallel among the writings of ancient and modern masters. But in every case this marvellous effect will, when carefully examined, be found to depend on something wholly or partially extrinsic to the style. Mr. Ruskin writes beautifully because he thinks beautifully, because his thoughts spring, like Pallas, ready armed, and the fashion of the armour costs him nothing. Everybody has heard of the unlucky critic whose comment on Scott's fertility was that "the invention was not to be counted, for that came to him of its own accord." So it is with Mr. Ruskin. His beauties of style "come to him of their own accord," and then he writes as the very gods might dream of writing. But in the moments when he is off the

(1) I have for the present thought it better to leave out of consideration the probable effect of the diminished study of classics in modern school and university education. That this effect is decidedly adverse to the cultivation of style is sufficiently obvious, but the subject is too complicated to be incidentally treated, and perhaps the diminution itself is too recent for its effects to have been as yet much felt.

tripod, or is upon some casual and un-Delphic tripod of his own construction or selection, how is his style altered! The strange touches of unforeseen colour become splashed and gaudy, the sonorous roll of the prophetic sentence-paragraphs drags and wriggles like a wounded snake, the cunning interweaving of scriptural or poetic phrase is patched and seamy. A Balaam on the Lord's side, he cannot curse or bless but as it is revealed to him, whereas the possessor of a great style can use it at will. He can shine on the just and on the unjust; can clothe his argument for tyranny or for liberty, for virtue or for vice, with the same splendour of diction, and the same unperturbed perfection of manner; can convince us, carry us with him, or leave us unconvinced but admiring, with the same unquestioned supremacy and the same unruffled calm. Swift can write a *jeu d'esprit* and a libel on the human race, a political pamphlet and a personal lampoon, with the same felicity and the same vigour. Berkeley can present tar-water and the Trinity, the theory of vision and the follies of contemporary free-thinking, with the same perfect lucidity and the same colourless fairness. But with Mr. Ruskin all depends on the subject, and the manner in which the subject is to be treated. He cannot even blame as he can praise; and there must be many who are ready to accept everything he can say of Tintoret or of Turner, and who feel no call to object to any of his strictures on Canaletto or on Claude, who yet perceive painfully the difference of style in the panegyrist and the detractor, and who would demand the stricter if less obvious justice, and the more artistic if apparently perverted sensitiveness, of the thorough master of style.

But if we have to quarrel with Mr. Ruskin because he has not sufficient command of the unquestioned beauties of his style, because he is not, in Carow's words—

"A king who rules as he thinks fit  
The universal monarchy of wit,"

but is rather a slave to his own thoughts and fancies, a very opposite fault must be found with the next writer who falls to be mentioned. "We do not," says an author with whom I am surprised to find myself in even partial and temporary agreement, "we do not get angry so much with what Mr. Matthew Arnold says as with his insufferable manner of saying it." In other words, there is no fear of omitting to notice a deliberate command and peculiarity of manner in Mr. Arnold, whether that manner be considered "insufferable" or no. For myself I must confess, that though I have very rarely felt the least inclination to get angry with anything which the author of *Culture and Anarchy* may have chosen to say, and though I have in common with all the youth of Zion an immense debt to acknowledge to his vindication of our faith

and freedom from the chains of Philistia, yet I could very frequently find it in my heart to wish that Mr. Arnold had chosen any other style than that which appears to afford him such extreme delight. Irony is an admirable thing, but it must be grave and not grimacing. Innocence is an admirable thing, but it should not be affected. To have a manner of one's own is an admirable thing, but to have a mannerism of one's own is perhaps not quite so admirable. It is curious that his unfortunately successful pursuit of this latter possession should have led Mr. Arnold to adopt a style which has more than any other the fault he justly censured twenty years ago as the special vice of modern art—the fault of the *fantastic*. No doubt the great masters of style have each a *cachet* which is easily decipherable by a competent student; no doubt, in spite of Lord Macaulay, Arbuthnot is to be distinguished from Swift, and the cunningest imitators of Voltaire from Voltaire himself. But to simulate this distinction by the deliberate adoption of mere tricks and manners is what no true master of style ever yet attempted, because for no true master of style was it ever yet necessary. Mr. Ruskin, to use the old Platonic simile, has not his horses sufficiently well in hand; at times the heavenly steed, with a strong and sudden flight, will lift the car amid the empyrean, at times the earth-born yoke-fellow will drag it down, with scarcely the assistance and scarcely the impediment of the charioteer. But even this is better than the driving of one who has broken his horses, indeed, but has broken them to little but the mincing graces of the Lady's Mile.

It is not possible to speak with equal definiteness of the style of a third master of English prose, who ranks in point of age and of reputation with Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Arnold. It would certainly be an over-hasty or an ill-qualified critic who should assert that Mr. Froude's style is always faultless; but, on the other hand, it may be asserted, without any fear whatever of contradiction carrying weight, that at its best it is surpassed by no style of the present day, and by few of any other, and that at its worst its faults are, not of a venial character, for no fault in art is venial, but at any rate of a kind which may meet with more ready excuse than those of the writers previously noticed. These faults are perhaps two only—undue diffuseness and undue aiming at the picturesque. We have seen that these are the two most glaring faults of the age, and by his indulgence in them, and the splendid effects which he has produced by that indulgence, Mr. Froude has undoubtedly earned his place, if not as a *Säcularischer Mensch*, at any rate as a representative man. No one, perhaps, who has read can fail to count among the triumphs of English prose the descriptions of the Pilgrimage of Grace in the History, of Sir Richard Grenvil's last fight in the Short Studies, of the wreckers at Ballyhige in the English in

Ireland. There are also many shorter passages which exhibit almost every excellence that the most exacting critic could demand. But it is not to be denied that Mr. Froude has very frequently bowed the knee before the altar of Baal. It is unlawful to occupy twelve mighty volumes with the history of one nation during little more than half a century : it is unlawful for the sound critical reason of St. John, that if such a practice obtained universally, the world could not contain the books that should be written ; and also for the reason that in such writing it is almost impossible to observe the reticence and compression which are among the lamps of style. It is unlawful to imagine and set down, except very sparingly, the colour of which the trees probably were at the time when kings and queens made their entrance into such and such a city, the buildings which they may or may not have looked upon, the thoughts which may or may not have occurred to them. Such sacrificings at the shrine of Effect, such trespassings on the domains and conveying of the methods of other arts and alien muses, are not to be commended or condoned. But one must, at the same time, allow with the utmost thankfulness that there are whole paragraphs, if not whole pages, of Mr. Froude's, which, for practised skill of composition and for legitimate beauty of effect, may take their place among the proudest efforts of English art.

It will probably be agreed that the three writers whom I have noticed stand at the head of contemporary English prose authors in point of age and authority ; but there are other and younger authors who must necessarily be noticed in any account of the subject which aims at completeness. Mr. Swinburne's progress as a prose writer can hardly have failed to be a subject of interest, almost equally with his career as a poet, to every lover of our tongue. His earliest appearance, the *Essay on Byron*, is even now in many respects characteristic of his work ; but it does not contain—and it is a matter of sincere congratulation for all lovers of English prose that it does not contain—any passage at all equal to the magnificent descant on Marlowe, which closes its ten years younger brother, the *Essay on Chapman*. In the work which has occupied this interval, the merits and defects of Mr. Swinburne as a prose writer may be read by whoso wills. At times it has seemed as if the weeds would grow up with the good seed and choke it. Mr. Swinburne has fallen into the error, not unnatural for a poet, of forgetting that the figures and the language allowable in poetry are not also allowable in prose. The dangerous luxury of alliteration has attracted him only too often, and the still more dangerous license of the figure called chiasmus has been to him even as a siren, from whose clutches he has been hardly saved. But the noticeable thing is that the excellences of his prose speech have grown ever stronger and its



weaknesses weaker since he began. In the *Essay on Blake*, admirable as was much thereof, a wilful waste of language, not unfrequently verging on a woful want of sense, was too frequently apparent. In the *Notes on his Poems*, and in *Under the Microscope*, just as was most of the counter-criticism, it was impossible not to notice a tendency to verbiage and a proneness, I will not say to prefer sound to sense, but unnecessarily to reinforce sense with sound. But at the same time, in the *Essays and Studies*, and the *Essay on Chapman*, no competent critic could fail to notice, notwithstanding occasional outbreaks, the growing reticence and severity of form, as well as the increasing weight and dignity of meaning. Mr. Swinburne, as a prose writer, is in need of nothing but the pruning-hook. Most of his fellows are in want chiefly of something which might be worth pruning.

It is obviously impossible in the present article to notice minutely all even of the more prominent names in contemporary prose. Some there are among the older of our writers who yet retain the traditions of the theological school of writing, to which style owes so much. A good deal might be said of Cardinal Manning's earlier style (for his progress in this hierarchy has hardly corresponded with his promotion in the other), as well as of Dr. Newman's admirable clearness and form, joined as it is, perhaps unavoidably, to a certain hardness of temper. Mr. Disraeli's stylistic peculiarities would almost demand an essay to themselves. They have never perhaps had altogether fair play; for novel-writing and politics are scarcely friends to style. But Mr. Disraeli has the root of the matter in him, and has never been guilty of the degradation of the sentence, which is the crying sin of modern prose; while his unequalled felicity in the selection of single epithets (witness the famous "*Batavian graces*" and a thousand others) gives him a supply of legitimate ornament which few writers have ever had at command. Tastes, I suppose, will always differ as to the question whether his ornamentation is not sometimes illegitimate. The parrot-cry of upholstery is easily raised. But I think we have at last come to see that rococo work is good and beautiful in its way, and he must be an ungrateful critic who objects to the somewhat lavish emeralds and rubies of the *Arabian Nights*. Of younger writers, there are not many whose merits it would be proper to specify in this place; while the prevailing defects of current style have been already fully noticed. But there is one book of recent appearance which sets the possibilities of modern English prose in the most favourable light, and gives the liveliest hope as to what may await us, if writers, duly heeding the temptations to which they are exposed, and duly availing themselves of the opportunities for study and imitation which are at their disposal, should set themselves seriously to work to

develop *pro virili* the prose resources of the English tongue. Of the merely picturesque beauty of Mr. Pater's *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, there can be no necessity for me to say anything here. In the first place it cannot escape the notice of any one who reads the book, and in the second, if there be any truth in what has been already said, the present age by no means needs to be urged to cultivate or to appreciate this particular excellence. The important point for us is the purely formal or regular merit of this style, and this is to be viewed with other eyes and tested by other methods than those which are generally brought to bear by critics of the present day. The main point which I shall notice is the subordinate and yet independent beauty of the sentences when taken separately from the paragraph. This is a matter of the very greatest importance. In too much of our present prose the individual sentence is unceremoniously robbed of all proper form and comeliness. If it adds its straw to the heap, its duty is supposed to be done. Mr. Pater has not fallen in this error, nor has he followed the multitude to do evil in the means which he has adopted for the production of the singular "sweet attractive kind of grace" which distinguishes these *Studies*. A bungler would have depended, after the fashion of the day, upon strongly coloured epithets, upon complicated and quasi-poetic cadences of phrase, at least upon an obtrusively voluptuous softness of thought and a cumbrous protraction of sentence. Not so Mr. Pater. There is not to be discovered in his work the least sacrifice of the phrase to the word, of the clause to the phrase, of the sentence to the clause, of the paragraph to the sentence. Each holds its own proper place and dignity while contributing duly to the dignity and place of its superior in the hierarchy. Let any reader turn to pp. 15, 16, or pp. 118, 119, of the book, and see, as he cannot fail to see, the extraordinary mastery with which this complicated success is attained. Often the cadence of the sentence considered separately will seem to be—and will in truth be—quite different from that of the paragraph, because its separate completeness demands this difference. Yet the total effect, so far from being marred, is enhanced. There is no surer mark of the highest style than this separate and yet subordinate finish. In the words of Mr. Ruskin, it is "so modulated that every square inch is a perfect composition."

It is this perfection of modulation to which we must look for the excellence that we require and do not meet with in most of the work of the present day, and it is exactly this modulation with which all the faults that I have had to comment upon in the preceding pages are inconsistent. To an artist who should set before him such a model as either of the passages which I have quoted, lapses into such faults would be impossible. He will not succumb to the easy diffuseness which may obliterate the just proportion and

equilibrium of his periods. He will not avail himself of the ready assistance of stereotyped phrasology to spare himself the trouble of casting new moulds and devising new patterns. He will not imagine that he is a scene painter instead of a prose writer, a decorator instead of an architect, a caterer for the desires of the many instead of a priest to the worship of the few. He will not indulge in a style which requires the maximum of ornament in order to disguise and render palatable the minimum of art and of thought. He will not consider it his duty to provide, at the least possible cost of intellectual effort on the part of the reader, something which may delude him into the idea that he is exercising his judgment and his taste. And, above all, he will be careful that his sentences have an independent completeness and harmony, no matter what purpose they may be designed to fulfil. For the sentence is the unit of style; and by the cadence and music, as well as by the purport and bearing, of his sentences, the master of style must stand or fall. For years, almost for centuries, French prose has been held up as a model to English prose writers, and for the most part justly. Only of late has the example come to have something of the Helot about it. The influence of Victor Hugo—an influence almost omnipotent among the younger generation of French literary men—has been exercised in prose with a result almost as entirely bad as its effect in verse has been good. The rules of verse had stiffened and cramped French poetry unnaturally, and violent exercise was the very thing required to recover suppleness and strength; but French prose required no such surgery, and it has consequently lost its ordered beauty without acquiring compensatory charms. The proportions of the sentence have been wilfully disregarded, and the result is that French prose is probably now at a lower point of average merit than at any time for two centuries.

That an art should be fully recognised as an art, with strict rules and requirements, is necessary to attainment of excellence in it; and in England this recognition, which poetry has long enjoyed, has hardly yet been granted to prose. No such verses as we find by scores in such books as Marston's *Satires* would now suggest themselves as possible or tolerable to any writer of Marston's powers; but in prose many a sentence quite as intolerable as any of these verses is constantly written by persons of presumably sound education and competent wits. The necessities of the prose writer are, an ear in the first place: this is indispensable and perhaps not too common. In the second place, due study of the best authors, as well to know what to avoid as what to imitate. Lastly, care, which perhaps is not too much to demand of any artist, so soon as he has recognised and has secured recognition of the fact that he is an artist. Care is

indeed the one thrice-to-be-repeated and indispensable property of the prose writer. It is pre-eminently necessary to him for the very reason that it is so easy to dispense with it, and to write prose without knowing what one does. Verse, at least verse which is to stand, as Johnson says, "the test of the finger if not of the ear," cannot be written without conscious effort and observation. But something which may be mistaken for prose can unfortunately be produced without either taste, or knowledge, or care. With these three requisites there should be no limit to the beauty and to the variety of the results obtained. The fitness of English for prose composition will hardly be questioned, though it may be contended with justice that perhaps in no other language has the average merit of its prose been so far below the excellence of its most perfect specimens. But the resources which in the very beginning of the practice of original composition in fully organised English could produce the splendid and thoughtful, if quaint and cumbrous, embroideries of Euphuus and the linked sweetness of the Arcadia, which could give utterance to the symphonies of Browne and Milton, which could furnish and suffice for the matchless simplicity of Bunyan, the splendid strength of Swift, the transparent clearness of Middleton and Berkeley, the stately architecture of Gibbon, are assuredly equal to the demands of any genius that may arise to employ them.

It is therefore the plain duty of every critic to assist at least in impressing upon the mass of readers that they do not receive what they ought to receive from the mass of writers, and in suggesting a multiplication and tightening of the requirements which a prosaist must fulfil. There are some difficulties in the way of such impression and suggestion in the matter of style. It is not easy for the critic to escape being bidden, in the words of Nicholas Breton, "not to talk too much of it, having so little of it," or to avoid the obvious jest of Diderot on Beccaria, that he had written an "*ouvrage sur le style où il n'y a point de style.*" For, unluckily, fault-finding is an ungracious business, and in criticising prose as prose the criticism has to be mostly fault-finding, the pleasanter if even harder task of discriminating appreciation being as a rule withheld from the critic. But I can see no reason why this state of things should continue, and I know no Utopia which ought to be more speedily rendered *topie*, than that in which at least the same censure which is now incurred by a halting verse, a discordant rhyme, or a clumsy stanza, should be accorded to a faultily-arranged clause, to a sentence of inharmonious cadence, to a paragraph of irregular and ungraceful architecture.

GEORGE SAINTSBURY.

## THE MYTH OF DEMETER AND PERSEPHONE.<sup>1</sup>

THE stories of the Greek mythology, like other things which belong to no man, and for which no one in particular is responsible, had their fortunes. In this world of floating fancies there was a struggle for life; there were myths which never emerged from that first state of popular conception, or were absorbed by stronger competitors, because, as some true heroes have done, they lacked the sacred poet or prophet, and were never remodelled by literature; while out of the myth of Demeter, cared for by art and poetry, came the little pictures of the Homeric hymn, and the gracious imagery of Praxiteles. The myth has now entered its second or poetical phase then, in which more definite fancies are grouped about the primitive stock in a literary temper, and the whole interest settles round the images of the beautiful girl going down into the darkness, and the weary woman who seeks her lost daughter; divine persons, then sincerely believed in by the majority of the people. The Homeric hymn is the central monument of this second phase. In it, the changes of the natural year have become a personal history, a story of human affection and sorrow, yet with a far-reaching religious significance also, of which the mere earthly spring and autumn are but an analogy; and in the development of this human element, the writer of the Homeric hymn sometimes displays a genuine power of pathetic expression. The whole episode of the rearing of Demophoon, in which human longing and regret are blent so subtly, over the poor body of the dying child, with the mysterious design of the goddess to make the child immortal, is an excellent example of the sentiment of pity in literature. Yet though it has reached the stage of literary interpretation, much of the early mystical character still lingers about the story, as it is here told. Later mythologists simply define the personal history; but in this hymn we may again and again trace curious links of connexion with the original meaning of the myth. Its subject is the weary woman indeed, the *mater dolorosa* of the ancient world, but with a certain latent reference all through to the mystical person of the earth. Her robe of dark blue is the raiment of her mourning, but also the blue robe of the earth in shadow, as we see it in Titian's landscapes; her great age is the age of the immemorial earth; she becomes a nurse, therefore, holding Demophoon in her bosom; the folds of her garment are fragrant, not merely with the incense of Eleusis, but with the natural scents of flowers and fruit. The sweet breath with which she nourishes the

(1) Concluded from the *Fortnightly Review* for January.

child Demophoon, is the warm west wind, feeding all germs of vegetable life ; her bosom, where he lies, is the bosom of the earth, with its strengthening heat, reserved and shy, and angry if human eyes scrutinise too closely its secret chemistry ; it is with the earth's surface of varied colour that she has "in time past pleased the sun ;" the yellow hair which falls suddenly over her shoulders, at her transformation in the house of Celeus, is still partly the golden corn—in art and poetry she is ever the blond goddess ; tarrying in her temple, of which an actual hollow in the earth is the prototype, among the spicy odours of the Eleusinian ritual, she is the spirit of the earth, lying hidden in its dark folds until the return of spring, among the flower-seeds and fragrant roots, like the seeds and aromatic woods hidden in the wrappings of the dead. All through the poem we have a sense of a certain nearness to nature, surviving from an earlier world ; the sea is understood as a person, yet is still the real sea, with its waves moving. When it is said that no bird gave Demeter tidings of Persephone, we feel that to that earlier world, ways of communication between all creatures may have seemed open, which are closed to us. It is Iris who brings to Demeter the message of Zeus ; that is, the rainbow signifies to the earth the good-will of the rainy sky towards it. Persephone springing up with great joy from the couch of Aidoneus, to return to her mother, is the sudden outburst of the year. The heavy and narcotic aroma of spring flowers hangs about her, as about the actual spring. And this mingling of the primitive import of the myth with the later personal interests of the story, is curiously illustrated by the place which the poem assigns to Hecate. This strange Titaness is first a nymph only ; afterwards, as if changed incurably by the passionate cry of Persephone, she becomes her constant attendant, and is even identified with her. But in the Homeric hymn her lunar character is clear ; she is really the moon only, who hears the cry of Persephone, as the sun saw her, when Aidoneus carried her away. One morning, as the mother wandered, the moon appeared, as it does in its last quarter, rising very bright, just before dawn ; that is, "on the tenth morning Hecate met her, having a light in her hands." The fascinating, but enigmatical figure, "sitting ever in her cave, half-veiled with a shining veil, thinking delicate thoughts," in which we seem to see the subject of some picture of the Italian Renaissance, is the lover of Endymion, like Persephone, withdrawn, in her season, from the eyes of men. The sun saw her ; the moon saw her not, but heard her cry, and is ever after the half-veiled attendant of the queen of the dead and of dreams.

But the story of Demeter and Persephone lends itself naturally to description, and it is in descriptive beauties that the Homeric hymn excels ; its episodes are finished designs, and directly stimulate the

painter and the sculptor to a rivalry with them. Weaving the names of the flowers into his verse, names familiar to us in English, though their Greek originals are uncertain, the writer sets Persephone before us, herself like one of them—*καλυκῶπις*—like the budding calyx of a flower—in a picture, which in its mingling of a quaint freshness and simplicity with a certain earnestness, reads like a description of some early Florentine design, such as Sandro Botticelli's *Allegory of the Seasons*. By an exquisite chance also, a common metrical expression connects the perfume of the newly created narcissus with the salt odour of the sea. Like one of those early designs again, but with a deeper infusion of religious earnestness, is the picture of Demeter sitting at the wayside, in shadow as always, with the well of water and the olive-tree. She has been journeying all night, and now it is morning, and the daughters of Celeus bring their vessels to draw water. That image of the seated Demeter, resting after her long flight "through the dark continent," or in the house of Celeus, when she refuses the red wine, or again, solitary, in her newly-finished temple of Eleusis, enthroned in her grief, fixed itself deeply on the Greek imagination, and became a favourite subject of Greek artists. When the daughters of Celeus come to conduct her to Eleusis, they come as in a Greek frieze, full of energy and motion and waving lines, but with gold and colours upon it. Eleusis—coming—the *coming* of Demeter thither, as thus told in the Homeric hymn, is the central instance in Greek mythology of such divine appearances. "She leaves for a season the company of the gods and abides among men," and men's merit is to receive her in spite of appearances. Metaneira and others in the Homeric hymn partly detect her divine character; they find a *χάρις*, a certain divine air about her, which makes them think her perhaps a royal person in disguise. She becomes in her long wanderings almost wholly humanised, and in return, she and Persephone, alone of the Greek gods, seem to have been the objects of a sort of personal love and loyalty. Yet they are ever the solemn goddesses, *θαυ̑ σεμναί*, the word expressing religious awe, the Greek sense of the divine presence.

Plato, in laying down the rules by which the poets are to be guided in speaking about divine things to the citizens of the ideal republic, forbids all those episodes of mythology which represent the gods as assuming various forms, and visiting the earth in disguise. Below the express reasons which he assigns for this rule, we may perhaps detect that instinctive antagonism to the old Heraclitean philosophy of perpetual change, which forces him, in his theory of morals and the state, of poetry and music, of dress and manners even, and of style in the very vessels and furniture of daily life, on an austere simplicity, the older Dorian or Egyptian type of a rigid, eternal immobility. The disintegrating, centrifugal influence, which

had penetrated, as he thought, political and social existence, making men too myriad-minded, had laid hold on the life of the gods also, and, even in their calm sphere, one might hardly identify a single divine person as himself, and not another. There must then be no doubling, no disguises, no stories of transformation. The modern reader, however, will hardly acquiesce in this improvement of Greek mythology. He finds in these stories, like that, for instance, of the appearance of Athene to Telemachus, in the first book of the *Odyssey*, which has a quite biblical mysticity and solemnity, stories in which, the hard material outline breaking up, the gods lay aside their visible form like a garment, and remain themselves, not the least spiritual element of Greek religion, an evidence of the sense in them of unseen presences, which might at any moment cross a man's path, to be recognised, in half disguise, by the more delicately trained eye, here or there, by one and not by another. Whatever religious elements they lacked, they had at least this sense of remote and subtler ways of personal presence.

We have to travel a long way from the Homeric hymn to the hymn of Callimachus, who writes in the end of Greek literature, in the third century before Christ, in celebration of the procession of the sacred basket of Demeter, not at the Attic, but at the Alexandrian Eleusinia. He develops, in something of the prosaic spirit of a medieval writer of mysteries, one of the burlesque incidents of the story, the insatiable hunger which seized on Erysichthon because he cut down a grove sacred to the goddess. Yet he finds his opportunities for skilful touches of poetry. "As the four white horses draw her sacred basket," he says, "so will the great goddess bring us a *white spring*, a *white summer*." He describes the grove itself, with its hedge of trees, so thick that an arrow could hardly pass through, its pines and fruit-trees and tall poplars within, and the water, like pale gold, running from the conduits. It is one of those famous poplars that receives the first stroke; it sounds heavily to its companion trees, and Demeter perceives that her sacred grove is suffering. Then comes one of those transformations which Plato will not allow. Vainly anxious to save the lad from his ruin, she appears in the form of a priestess, but with the long hood of the goddess, and the poppy in her hand; and there is something of a real shudder, some still surviving sense of a haunting presence among the trees, in the verses which describe her sudden revelation, when the workmen flee away, leaving their axes in the cleft trees.

Of the same age as the hymn of Callimachus, but with very different qualities, is the idyll of Theocritus on the *Shepherds' Journey*. Although it is possible to define an epoch in mythological development in which literary and artificial influences began to remodel the primitive, popular legend, yet still, among children, and



unchanging childlike people, we may suppose that that primitive stage always survived, and the old instinctive influences were still at work. As the subject of popular religious celebrations also, the myth was still the property of the people, and surrendered to its capricious action. The shepherds in Theocritus, on their way to celebrate one of the more homely feasts of Demeter about the time of harvest, are examples of these childlike people; the age of the poets has long since come, but they are of the older and simpler order, lingering on in the midst of a more conscious world. In an idyll, itself full of the delightful gifts of Demeter, Theocritus sets them before us; through the blazing summer day's journey, the smiling image of the goddess is always before them. And now they have reached the end of their journey:

"So I, and Eucritus, and the fair Amyntichus, turned aside into the house of Phrasidamus, and lay down with delight in beds of sweet tamarisk and fresh cuttings from the vines, strewn on the ground. Many poplars and elm-trees were waving over our heads, and not far off the running of the sacred water from the cave of the nymphs warbled to us; in the shimmering branches the sun-burnt grasshoppers were busy with their talk, and from afar the little owl cried softly out of the tangled thorns of the blackberry; the larks were singing and the hedge-birds, and the turtle-dove moaned; the bees flew round and round the fountains, murmuring softly; the scent of late summer and the fall of the year was everywhere; the pears fell from the trees at our feet, and apples in number rolled down at our sides, and the young plum-trees were bent to the earth with the weight of their fruit. The wax, four years old, was loosed from the heads of the wine-jars. O! nymphs of Castalia, who dwell on the steepes of Parnassus, tell me, I pray you, was it a draught like this that the aged Chiron placed before Hercules, in the stony cave of Pholus? Was it nectar like this that made the mighty shepherd on Anapus' shore, Polyphemus, who flung the rocks upon Ulysses' ships, dance among his sheepfolds?—A cup like this ye poured out now upon the altar of Demeter, who presides over the threshing-floor. May it be mine once more to thrust my big winnowing-fan through her heaps of corn; and may I see her smile upon me, holding poppies and handfuls of corn in her two hands!"

Some of the modifications of the story of Demeter, as we find it in later poetry, have been supposed to be due, not to the genuine action of the Greek mind, but to the influence of that so-called Orphic literature, which, in the generation succeeding Hesiod, brought from Thessaly and Phrygia a tide of mystical ideas into the Greek religion, sometimes, doubtless, confusing the clearness and naturalness of its original outlines, but also sometimes imparting to them a new and peculiar grace. Under the influence of this Orphic

poetry, Demeter was blended, or identified, with Rhea Cybele, the mother of the gods, the wilder earth-goddess of Phrygia; and the romantic figure of Dionysus Zagreus, Dionysus *the Hunter*, that most interesting, though somewhat melancholy variation on the better known Dionysus, was brought, as son or brother of Persephone, into her circle, the mystical vine, who, as Persephone descends and ascends from the earth, is rent to pieces by the Titans every year and remains long in Hades, but every spring-time comes out of it again, renewing his youth. This identification of Demeter with Rhea Cybele is the motive which has inspired a beautiful chorus in the *Helena*, the new *Helena*, of Euripides, that great lover of all subtle refinements and modernisms, who, in this play, has worked on a strange version of the older story, which relates that only the phantom of Helen had really gone to Troy, herself remaining in Egypt all the time, at the court of King Proteus, where she is found at last by her husband Menelaus. The chorus has even less than usual to do with the action of the play, being linked to it only by a sort of parallel which may be understood between Menelaus seeking Helen, and Demeter seeking Persephone. Euripides then takes the matter of the Homeric hymn into the region of a higher and swifter poetry, and connects them with the more stimulating imagery of the Idæan mother. The Orphic mysticism or enthusiasm has been admitted into the story, which is now full of excitement, the motion of rivers, the sounds of the Bacchic cymbals heard over the mountains, as Demeter wanders among the woody valleys seeking her lost daughter, all directly expressed in the vivid Greek words. Demeter is no longer the subdued goddess of the quietly-ordered fields, but the mother of the gods, who has her abode in the heights of Mount Ida, who presides over the dews and waters of the white springs, whose flocks feed, not on grain, but on the curling tendrils of the vine, both of which she withholds in her anger, and whose chariot is drawn by wild beasts, fruit and emblem of the earth in its fiery strength. Not Hecate, but Pallas and Artemis in full armour, swift-footed, vindicators of chastity, accompany her in her search for Persephone, who is already expressly, *κόρη ἄρρητος*. When she rests from her long wanderings, it is into the stony thickets of Mount Ida, deep with snow, that she throws herself, in her deep grief. When Zeus desires to end her pain, the Muses and the solemn Graces are sent to dance and sing before her. It is then that Cypriis, the goddess of beauty, and the original cause, therefore, of her distress, takes into her hands the brazen tambourines of the Dionysiac worship with their Chthonian or deep-noted sound; and it is she, not the old Iambe, who with this wild music, heard thus for the first time, makes Demeter smile at last. "Great," so the chorus ends with a picture, "great is the power of the stoles of spotted

fawn-skins, and the green leaves of ivy twisted about the sacred wands, and the wheeling motion of the tambourine whirled round in the air, and the long hair floating unbound in honour of Bromius, and the nocturnes of the goddess, when the moon looks full upon them."

The poem of Claudian on the *Rape of Proserpine*, the longest extant work connected with the story of Demeter, yet itself unfinished, closes the world of classical poetry. Writing in the fourth century of the Christian æra, Claudian has his subject before him in the whole extent of its various development, and also profits by those many pictorial representations of it, which, from the famous picture of Polygnotus downwards, delighted the ancient world. His poem, then, besides having an intrinsic charm, is valuable for some reflection in it of those lost works, being itself pre-eminently a work in colour, and excelling in a kind of painting in words, which brings its subject very pleasantly almost to the eye of the reader. The mind of this late votary of the old gods, in a world rapidly changing, is crowded by all the beautiful forms generated by mythology, and now about to be forgotten. In this after-glow of Latin literature, lighted up long after their fortune had set, and just before their long night began, they pass before us in his verses with the utmost clearness, like the figures in an actual procession. The nursing of the infant Sun and Moon by Tethys; Proserpine and her companions gathering flowers at early dawn, when the violets are drinking in the dew, still lying white upon the grass; the image of Pallas winding the peaceful blossoms about the steel crest of her helmet; the realm of Proserpine, softened somewhat by her coming, and filled with a quiet joy; the matrons of Elysium crowding to her marriage toilet, with the bridal veil of yellow in their hands; the Manes crowned with ghostly flowers and warmed a little at the marriage feast; the ominous dreams of the mother; the desolation of the home, like an empty bird's-nest or an empty fold, when she returns and finds Proserpine gone, and the spider at work over her unfinished embroidery; the strangely-figured raiment, the flowers in the grass, which were once blooming youths, having both their natural colour and the colour of their poetry in them, and the clear little fountain there, which was once the maiden Cyane; all this is shown in a series of descriptions, like the designs in some unwinding tapestry, like Proserpine's own embroidery, the description of which is the most brilliant of these pictures, and, in its quaint confusion of the images of philosophy with those of mythology, anticipates something of the fancy of the Italian Renaissance.

"Proserpina, filling the house soothingly with her low song, was working a gift against the return of her mother, with labour all to

be in vain. In it she marked out with her needle the houses of the gods and the series of the elements, showing by what law, nature, the parent of all, settled the strife of ancient times, and the seeds of things departed into their right places; the lighter elements are borne aloft, the heavier fall to the centre; the air grows light with heat, a blazing light whirls round with the firmament; the sea flows; the earth hangs suspended in its place. And there were divers colours in it; she illuminated the stars with gold, infused a purple shade into the water, and heightened the shore with gems of flowers; and under her skilful hand the threads, with their inwrought lustre, swell up, in momentary counterfeit of the waves; you might think that the sea-wind flapped against the rocks, and that a hollow murmur came creeping over the thirsty sands. She puts in the five zones, marking with a red ground the midmost zone, possessed by burning heat; its outline was parched and stiff; the threads seemed thirsty with the constant sunshine; on either side lay the two zones proper for human life, where a gentle temperance reigns; and at the extremes she drew the twin zones of numbing cold, making her work dun and sad with the hues of perpetual frost. She paints in, too, the sacred places of Dis, her father's brother, and the Manes, so fatal to her; and an omen of her doom was not wanting; for, as she worked, as if with foreknowledge of the future, her face became wet with a sudden burst of tears. And now, in the utmost border of the tissue, she had begun to wind in the wavy line of the river Oceanus, with its glassy shallows; but the door sounds on its hinges, and she perceives the goddesses coming; the unfinished work drops from her hands, and a ruddy blush lights up in her clear and snow-white face."

I have reserved to the last what is perhaps the daintiest treatment of this subject in classical literature, the account of it which Ovid gives in the *Fasti*, a kind of Roman Calendar, for the seventh of April, the day of the games of Ceres. He tells over again the old story, with much of which, he says, the reader will be already familiar; but he has something also of his own to add to it, which the reader will hear for the first time; and like one of those old painters who, in depicting a scene of Christian history, drew from their own fancy or experience its special setting and accessories, he translates the story into something very different from the Homeric hymn. The writer of the Homeric hymn had made Celeus a king, and represented the scene at Eleusis in a fair palace, like the Venetian painters who depict the persons of the Holy Family with royal ornaments. Ovid, on the other hand, is more like certain painters of the early Florentine school, who represent the holy persons among the more touching circumstances of humble life; and the special something of his own which he adds, is a pathos caught

from homely things, not without a delightful, just perceptible, shade of humour even, so rare in such work. All the mysticism has disappeared; but instead we trace something of that "worship of sorrow," which has been sometimes supposed to have had no place in classical religious sentiment. In Ovid's well-finished elegiacs, the *Anthology* reaches its utmost delicacy; but I give here the following episode for the sake of its pathetic expression.

"After many wanderings Ceres had come to Attica. There, in the utmost dejection, for the first time, she sat down to rest on a bare stone, which the people of Attica still call the *stone of sorrow*. For many days she remained there motionless, under the open sky, heedless of the rain and of the frosty moonlight. Places have their fortunes; and what is now the illustrious town of Eleusis was then the field of an old man named Ccleus. He was carrying home a load of acorns, and wild berries shaken down from the brambles, and dry wood for burning on the hearth; his little daughter was leading two goats home from the hills; and at home there was a little boy lying sick in his cradle. 'Mother,' said the little girl—and the goddess was moved at the name of mother—'what do you, all alone in this solitary place?' The old man stopped too, in spite of his heavy burden, and bade her take shelter in his cottage, though it was but a little one. But at first she refused to come; she looked like an old woman, and an old woman's coif confined her hair; and as the man still urged her, she said to him, 'Heaven bless you, and may children always be yours! My daughter has been stolen from me. Alas! how much happier is your lot than mine;' and, though weeping is impossible for the gods, as she spoke, a bright drop like a tear fell into her bosom. Soft-hearted, the little girl and the old man weep together. And after that the good man said, 'Arise! despise not the shelter of my little home; so may the daughter whom you seek be restored to you.' 'Lead me,' answered the goddess; 'you have found out the secret of moving me;' and she arose from the stone, and followed the old man; and as they went he told her of the sick child at home—how he is restless with pain, and cannot sleep. And she, before entering the little cottage, gathered from the untended earth the soothing and sleep-giving poppy; and as she gathered it, it is said that she forgot her vow, and tasted of the seeds, and broke her long fast, unaware. As she came through the door, she saw the house full of trouble, for now there was no more hope of life for the sick boy. She saluted the mother, whose name was Metaneira, and humbly kissed the lips of the child, with her own divine lips; then the paleness left its face, and suddenly the parents see the strength returning to its body; so great is the force that comes from the divine mouth. And the whole family was full of joy—the mother and the father and the little girl; they were the whole household."

## IV.

Three profound ethical conceptions, three impressive sacred figures, have now defined themselves for the Greek imagination, condensed from all the traditions which have here been traced, from the hymns of the poets, from the instinctive and unformulated mysticism of primitive minds. Demeter has become the divine sorrowing mother. Kore, the goddess of summer, has become Persephone, the goddess of death, still associated with the forms and odours of flowers and fruit, yet as one risen from the dead also, presenting one side of her ambiguous nature to men's gloomier fancies. Thirdly, there is the image of Demeter enthroned, chastened by sorrow, and somewhat advanced in age, blessing the earth, in her joy at the return of Kore. The myth has now entered on the third phase of its life, in which it becomes the property of those more elevated spirits, who, in the decline of the Greek religion, pick and choose and modify, with perfect freedom of mind, whatever in it may seem adapted to minister to their culture. In this way, the myths of the Greek religion become parts of an ideal, sensible embodiments of the susceptibilities and intuitions of the nobler kind of souls; and it is to this latest phase of mythological development that the highest Greek sculpture allies itself. Its function is to give visible, æsthetic expression to the constituent parts of that ideal. As poetry dealt chiefly with the *incidents* of the story, so it is with the *personages* of the story—with Demeter and Kore themselves—that sculpture has to do.

For the myth of Demeter, like the Greek religion in general, had its unlovelier side, grotesque, un-hellenic, unglorified by art, illustrated well enough by the description Pausanias gives us of his visit to the cave of the Black Demeter at Phigalia. In his time the image itself had vanished; but he tells us enough about it to enable us to realise its general characteristics, monstrous as the special legend with which it was connected, the black draperies, the horse's head united to the woman's body, with the carved reptiles creeping about it. If with the thought of this gloomy image of our mother the earth, in our minds, we take up one of those coins which bear the image of Kore or Demeter,<sup>1</sup> we shall better understand what the function of sculpture really was in elevating and refining the religious conceptions of the Greeks. Looking on the profile, for instance, on one of those coins of Messene, which almost certainly represent Demeter, and noting the crisp, chaste opening of the lips, the minutely wrought earrings, and the delicately touched ears of corn—

(1) On these small objects the mother and daughter are hard to distinguish, the latter being recognisable only by a greater delicacy in the features and the more evident stamp of youth.

this trifle being justly regarded as, in its æsthetic qualities, an epitome of art on a larger scale—we shall see how far the imagination of the Greeks had travelled from what their Black Demeter shows us had once been possible for them, and in making the gods of their worship the objects of a worthy companionship in men's thoughts. Certainly, the mind of the old workman who struck this coin was, if we may trust the testimony of his work, unclouded by impure or gloomy shadows. The thought of Demeter is impressed here with all the purity and proportion, the purged and dainty intelligence of the human countenance. The mystery of it is indeed absent, perhaps could hardly have been looked for in so slight a thing, intended for no sacred purpose, and tossed lightly from hand to hand. But in his firm hold on the harmonies of the human face, the designer of this tranquil head of Demeter is on the one road to a command over the secrets of all imaginative pathos and mystery; though, in the perfect fairness and blitheness of his work, he might seem almost not to have known the incidents of her terrible story.

It is probable that, at a later period than in other equally important temples of Greece, the earlier archaic representation of Demeter in the sanctuary of Eleusis, was replaced by a more beautiful image in the new style, with face and hands of ivory, having therefore, in tone and texture, some subtler likeness to women's flesh, and the closely enveloping drapery being constructed in daintily beaten plates of gold. Demeter and Kore have been traced in certain blurred figures of the Parthenon, of the school of Pheidias, therefore; but Praxiteles seems to have been the first to bring into the region of a freer artistic handling these shy deities of the earth, shrinking still within the narrow restraints of a hieratic, conventional treatment, long after the more genuine Olympians had broken out of them. The school of Praxiteles, as distinguished from that of Pheidias, is especially the school of grace, relaxing a little the severe ethical tension of the latter, in favour of a slightly Asiatic sinuosity and tenderness. Pausanias tells us that he carved the two goddesses for the temple of Demeter at Athens; and Pliny speaks of two groups of his in brass, the one representing the stealing of Persephone, the other her later, annual descent into Hades, conducted thither by the now pacified mother. All alike have perished; though perhaps some more or less faint reflection of the most important of these designs may still be traced on many painted vases which depict the stealing of Persephone, a helpless, plucked flower in the arms of Aidoneus. And in this almost traditional form, the subject was often represented, in low relief, on tombs, some of which still remain, in one or two instances, built up, oddly enough, in the walls of Christian churches. On the tombs of women who had died in early life, this was a favourite sub-

ject, some likeness of the actual lineaments of the deceased being sometimes transferred to the features of Persephone.

Yet so far, it might seem, when we consider the interest of this story in itself, and its importance in the Greek religion, that no adequate expression of it had remained to us in works of art. But in the year 1857, Mr. Newton's discovery of the marbles in the sacred precinct of Demeter at Cnidus restored to us an illustration of the myth in its artistic phase, hardly less central than the Homeric hymn in its poetical phase. With the help of the descriptions and plans of Mr. Newton's book,<sup>1</sup> we can form, as one always wishes to do in such cases, a clear idea of the place where these marbles, three statues of the best style of Greek sculpture, now in the British Museum, were found. Occupying a ledge of rock, looking towards the sea, at the base of a cliff of upheaved limestone, of singular steepness and regularity of surface, the spot presents indications of volcanic disturbance, as if a chasm in the earth had opened here. It was this character, suggesting the belief in an actual connexion with the interior of the earth, local tradition claiming it as the scene of the stealing of Persephone, which probably gave rise, as in other cases where the landscape presented some peculiar feature in harmony with the story, to the dedication upon it of a house and an image of Demeter, with whom were associated Kore and the gods with Demeter—οἱ θεοὶ παρὰ Δαμάτρη—Aidoneus, and the mystical Dionysus. The house seems to have been a small chapel only, of simple construction, and designed for private use, the site itself having been private property, consecrated by a particular family, for their own religious uses, although other persons, servants or dependents of the founders, may also have frequented it. The architecture seems to have been insignificant, but the sculpture costly and exquisite, belonging, if contemporary with the erection of the building, to a great period of Greek art, of which also it is judged to possess intrinsic marks, about the year 350 before Christ, the probable date of the dedication of the little temple. The artists by whom these works were produced were therefore either the contemporaries of Praxiteles, whose Venus was for many centuries the glory of Cnidus, or belonged to the generation immediately succeeding him. The temple itself was probably thrown down by a renewal of the volcanic disturbances; the statues however remaining, and the ministers and worshippers still continuing to make shift for their sacred business in the place, now doubly venerable, but with its temple unrestored, down to the second or third century of the Christian era, its frequenters being now perhaps mere chance comers, the family of the original donors having become extinct, or having deserted it. Into this later arrangement, divined clearly by Mr.

(1) *A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus, and Branci's la.*



Newton, through those faint indications which mean much for true experts, the extant remains, as they were found upon the spot, permit us to enter. It is one of the graves of that old religion, but with much still fresh in it. We see it with its provincial superstitions, and its curious magic rites, but also with its means of really solemn impressions, in the culminating forms of Greek art; the two faces of the Greek religion confronting each other here, and the whole having that rare peculiarity of a kind of personal stamp upon it, the place having been designed to meet the fancies of one particular soul, or at least of one family. It is always difficult to bring the every-day aspect of Greek religion home to us; but even the slighter details of this little sanctuary help us to do this; and knowing little, as we do, of the greater mysteries of Demeter, this glance into an actual religious place dedicated to her, and with the air of her worship still about it, is doubly interesting. The little votive figures of the goddesses in baked earth were still lying stored in the small treasury intended for such objects, or scattered about the feet of the images, together with lamps in great number, a lighted lamp being a favourite offering, in memory of the torches with which Demeter sought Persephone, or from some sense of inherent darkness in these gods of the earth, those torches in the hands of Demeter being originally the artificial warmth and brightness of lamp and fire on winter nights. The *dire* or spells, binding or devoting certain persons to the infernal gods, inscribed on thin rolls of lead, with holes sometimes for hanging them up about those quiet statues, still lay, just as they were left, anywhere within the sacred precinct, illustrating at once the gloomier side of the Greek religion in general, and of Demeter and Persephone especially, in their character of avenging deities, and, as relics of ancient magic reproduced so strangely at other times and places, reminding us of the permanence of certain odd ways of human thought. A woman binds with her spell the person who seduces her husband away from her and her children; another the person who has accused her of preparing poison for her husband; another devotes one who has not restored a borrowed garment, or has stolen a bracelet, or certain drinking-horns; and, from some instances, we might infer that this was a favourite place of worship for the poor and ignorant. In this living picture we find still lingering on, at the foot of the beautiful Greek marbles, that phase of religious temper which a cynical mind might think a truer link of its unity and permanence than any higher æsthetic instincts, a phase of it which the art of sculpture, humanising and refining man's conceptions of the unseen, tended constantly to do away. For the higher side of the Greek religion, thus humanised and refined by art, and elevated by it to the sense of beauty, is here also.

There were three ideal forms, as we saw, gradually shaping themselves in the development of the story of Demeter, waiting only for complete realisation at the hands of the sculptor; and now, with these forms in our minds, let us place ourselves in thought before the three images which once probably occupied, one of them being then wrought on a larger scale, the three niches or ambries in the face of that singular cliff at Cnidus. Of the three figures, one probably represents Persephone, as the goddess of the dead; the second, Demeter enthroned; the third is probably a portrait-statue of a priestess of Demeter, but may perhaps, even so, represent Demeter herself, Demeter *Achæa*, Ceres *Deserta*, the *mater dolorosa* of the Greeks, a type not as yet recognised in any other work of ancient art. Certainly it seems hard not to believe that this work is in some way connected with the legend of the place to which it belonged, and the main subject of which it realises so completely; and, at least, it shows how the higher Greek sculpture would have worked out this motive. If Demeter at all, it is Demeter the secker, Δηώ, as she was called in the mysteries, in some pause of her restless wandering over the world in search of the lost child, and become at last an abstract type of the wanderer. The Homeric hymn, as we saw, had its sculptural motives, the great gestures of Demeter, who was ever the stately goddess, as she followed the daughters of Celeus, or sat by the well-side, or went out and in, through the halls of the palace, expressed in monumental words. With the sentiment of that monumental Homeric presence this statue is penetrated, uniting a certain solemnity of attitude and bearing, to a profound piteousness, an unrivalled pathos of expression. There is something of the pity of Michelangelo's *pietà*, in the wasted form and the marred countenance, yet with the light breaking faintly over it from the eyes, which, contrary to the usual practice in ancient sculpture, are represented as looking upwards. It is the aged woman who has escaped from pirates, who has but just escaped being sold as a slave, calling on the young for pity. The sorrows of her long wanderings seem to have passed into the marble; and in this too, it meets the demands which the reader of the Homeric hymn, with its command over the resources of human pathos, makes upon the sculptor. The tall figure, in proportion above the ordinary height, is veiled, and clad to the feet in the longer tunic, its numerous folds hanging in heavy parallel lines, opposing the lines of the peplus, or cloak which cross it diagonally over the breast, enwrapping the upper portion of the body somewhat closely. It is the very type of the wandering woman, going grandly indeed, as Homer describes her, yet so human in her anguish, that I seem to recognise some far descended shadow of her, in the homely figure of the roughly clad French peasant woman, who, in one of Corot's pictures, is hasting

along under a sad light, as the day goes out behind the little hill. We have watched the growth of the merely personal sentiment in the story; and we may notice that, if this figure be indeed Demeter, then the conception of her has become wholly humanised; no trace of the primitive import of the myth, no colour or scent of the mystical earth, remains about it.

The seated figure, much mutilated and worn by long exposure, yet possessing, according to the best critics, marks of the school of Praxiteles, is almost undoubtedly the image of Demeter enthroned. Three times in the Homeric hymn she is represented as sitting, once by the fountain at the wayside, again in the house of Celeus, and again in the newly finished temple of Eleusis; but always in sorrow; seated on the πέτρα ἀγέλαστος, which, as Ovid told us, the people of Attica still called *the stone of sorrow*. Here she is represented in her later state of reconciliation, enthroned as the glorified mother of all things. The delicate plaiting of the tunic about the throat, the formal curling of the hair, and a certain weight of over-thoughtfulness in the brows, recall the manner of Lionardo, a master, one of whose characteristics is a very sensitive expression of the sentiment of maternity. I am reminded especially of a work by one of his scholars, the *Virgin of the Balances*, in the Louvre, a picture which has been thought to represent, under a veil, the blessing of universal nature, and in which the sleepy-looking heads, with a peculiar grace and refinement of somewhat advanced life in them, have just this half-weary posture. We see here, then, the Hera of the world below, the Stygian Juno, the chief of those Elysian matrons who come crowding, in the poem of Claudian, to the marriage toilet of Proserpine, the goddess of the fertility of the earth and of all creatures, but still of fertility as arisen out of death;<sup>1</sup> and therefore she is not without a certain pensiveness, having seen the seed fall into the ground and die, many times. Persephone has returned to her, and the hair spreads like a rich harvest over her shoulders; but she is still veiled, and knows that the seed must fall into the ground again, and Persephone descend again from her.

The statues of the supposed priestess, and of the enthroned Demeter, are of more than the size of life; the figure of Persephone is but seventeen inches high, a daintily handled toy of Parian marble, the miniature copy perhaps of a much larger work, which might well be reproduced on a magnified scale. The conception of Demeter is throughout chiefly human, and even domestic, though never without a hieratic interest, because she is not a goddess only, but also a priestess. In contrast, Persephone is wholly unearthly,

(1) "Pallere ligustra,  
Exspirare rosas, decrescere lilia vidi."

the close companion, and even the confused double, of Hecate, the goddess of midnight terrors, *Despina*, the final mistress of all that lives; and as sorrow is the characteristic sentiment of Demeter, so awe of Persephone. She is compact of sleep, and death, and flowers, but of narcotic flowers especially, a *revenant*, who in the garden of Aidoneus has eaten of the pomegranate, and bears always the secret of decay in her, in the mystery of its swallowed seeds; sometimes, in later work, holding in her hand the key of the great prison-house, but which unlocks all secrets also, there finally, or through oracles revealed in dreams; sometimes, like Demeter, the poppy, emblem of sleep and death by its narcotic juices, of life and resurrection by its innumerable seeds, of the dreams, therefore, that may intervene between falling asleep and waking. Treated as it is in the Homeric hymn, and still more in this statue, the image of Persephone may be regarded as the result of many efforts to lift the old Chthonian gloom, still living on in heavier souls, concerning the grave, to connect it with impressions of dignity and beauty, and a certain sweetness even: it is meant to make us in love, or at least at peace, with death. The Persephone of Praxiteles' school, then, is *Aphrodite-Persephone*, *Venus-Libitina*. Her shadowy eyes have gazed upon the fainter colouring of the under-world, and the tranquillity, born of it, has "passed into her face;" for the Greek Hades is, after all, but a quiet, twilight place, not very different from that *House of Fame* where Dante places the great souls of the classical world; Aidoneus himself being conceived in the highest Greek sculpture as but a gentler Zeus, the great innkeeper; so that when a certain Greek sculptor had failed in his portraiture of Zeus, because it had too little hilarity, too little in the eyes and brow of the open and cheerful sky, he only changed its title, and the thing passed excellently, with its heavy locks and shadowy eyebrows, for the god of the dead. The image of Persephone then, as it is here composed, with the tall tower-like head-dress, from which the veil depends—the corn-basket, originally carried thus by the Greek women, balanced on the head—giving the figure unusual length, has the air of a body bound about with grave-clothes; while the archaic hands and feet, and a certain stiffness in the folds of the drapery, give it something of a hieratic character, and to the modern observer may suggest a sort of kinship with the more chastened kind of Gothic work. But quite of the school of Praxiteles is the general character of the composition; the graceful waving of the hair, the fine shadows of the little face, of the eyes and lips especially, like the shadows of a flower—a flower risen noiselessly from its dwelling in the dust—though still with that fulness or heaviness in the brow, as of sleepy people, which, in the delicate gradations of Greek sculpture, distinguish the infernal deities from their Olympian kindred. The object placed in

the hand may be, perhaps, a stiff archaic flower, but is probably the partly consumed pomegranate, one morsel gone; the most usual emblem of Persephone being this mystical fruit, which, because of the multitude of its seeds, was to the Romans a symbol of fecundity, and was sold at the doors of the temples of Ceres, that the women might offer it there, and bear numerous children; and so, to the middle age, became a symbol of the fruitful earth itself; and then of that other seed sown in the dark under-world; and at last of that whole hidden region, so thickly sown, which Dante visited, Michelino painting him, in the *Duomo* of Florence, with this fruit in his hand, and Botticelli putting it into the childish hands of Him, who, if men "go down into hell, is there also."

There is an attractiveness in these goddesses of the earth akin to the influence of cool places, quiet houses, subdued light, tranquillising voices; for me, at least, I know it has been good to be with Demeter and Persephone, all the time I have been reading and thinking of them; and all through this essay, I have been asking myself, what is there in this phase of ancient religion for us at the present day? The myth of Demeter and Persephone, then, illustrates the power of the Greek religion as a religion of pure ideas, of conceptions, which having no link on historical fact, yet, because they arose naturally out of the spirit of man, and embodied, in adequate symbols, his deepest thoughts concerning the conditions of his physical and spiritual life, maintained their hold through many changes, and are still not without a solemnising power even for the modern mind, which has once admitted them as recognised and habitual inhabitants; and abiding thus for the elevation and purifying of our sentiments, long after the earlier and simpler races of their worshippers have passed away, they may be a pledge to us of the place in our culture, at once legitimate and possible, of the associations, the conceptions, the imagery, of Greek religious poetry in general, of the poetry of all religions.

WALTER H. PATER.

## THE NEW JUDICATURE.

- cœnæ fercula nostræ  
Malim convivis quam placuisse coquis."

MARTIAL.

THE majority of those who are neither lawyers nor litigants will probably be as much surprised to learn that the benefits of a new Judicial System have been thrown open to them for the last three months, as M. Jourdain was at being told that he had been talking prose for forty years. The transition has been so quietly managed as to have been almost imperceptible to laymen not directly interested in it. There have been no processions, or banners, or stump-orations, or political blue-fire of any kind. Even the debates in Parliament on the Judicature Acts were very thinly attended, and, as a rule, were much too esoteric for ordinary members to join in them. No one who was present in Westminster Hall on the 2nd of last November, the inaugural day of the new Supreme Court, would have detected any difference between what took place then and what had taken place there, at the commencement of Michaelmas term, in any former year. The outward symbols were the same, even down to the gold lace and the ermine; and the judges, marching in the old order, were received with the old marks of popular favour. But the change is not the less great for having been so soberly effected, and, before the new order of things becomes stale, it may be worth while to endeavour to estimate its true value. I am aware that a practising lawyer is not always the fittest person to explain, much less to popularise, the law; for it is extremely difficult for him to extricate himself from the professional vortex in which he moves. It is therefore not without diffidence that I venture to undertake the task within the narrow limits of these pages; I do so, as is implied in my motto (which has a deep meaning for law reformers), in the interest of the general reader, and with the full consciousness that I have to steer clear of two rocks—those of prejudice and pedantry.

It is hardly necessary to recall the time when Jeremy Bentham exposed the evils attendant on the separation of our tribunals of law and equity, for there is no improvement, political or other, which has not been long familiar to the realm of philosophy before it emerges into the light of common day. The noticeable point is, that the separation of the tribunals should have been forcibly condemned by two Royal Commissions appointed in 1850 and 1851, twenty years before the first Judicature Bill was introduced into Parliament, and that a quarter of a century should have been allowed to pass by before their recommendations were carried into practical effect. The

Chancery Amendment Act 1852, and the Common Law Procedure Acts 1852 and 1854, the legislative outcome of these Commissions, were little else than codes of procedure applicable to the several Courts whence their titles were taken. The Chancery Amendment Act 1858, and Sir John Rolt's Act of 1862 were partial and fragmentary measures which, while inviting a closer comparison of the opposite systems in vogue at Westminster and Lincoln's Inn, served rather to deepen than to diminish the contrast between them. Although they gave full power to the Court of Chancery to work out justice to the end, in those cases where the suitor had rightly invoked its aid; in all other cases they left its doors closed against him, and notwithstanding the ruinous costs he might have incurred in preparing his cause for trial, he still had to seek the redress, which he was admittedly entitled to, by commencing fresh proceedings elsewhere. This was just as if a physician having undertaken to cut off a diseased limb should unexpectedly lay an artery bare, and then leave the patient to bleed to death on the plea that he was not a pure surgeon.

The Royal Commission of 1867 issued its first report in 1869, and on that report Lord Chancellor Hatherley founded his Judicature Bill of 1870. It is well known that Lord Hatherley's bill failed, but the reasons of its failure are not easy to discover. It attempted to consolidate all the superior courts into one new court, to which it gave the title of the Supreme Court of Judicature; but owing to some weakness in its framework, it was damaged by the criticism that the new tribunal was, after all, only the old courts under a new name, and that the consolidation was more nominal than real. It had another defect which ought not to have been fatal, and in fact might have been easily remedied: it was wholly silent as to the course of procedure which the new Supreme Court should adopt, that being left, according to Lord Hatherley's first proposal, to be settled by a committee of judges, and by a committee of the Privy Council according to his second. On these two blots Lord Westbury lavished his withering sarcasm in the House of Lords, while the Lord Chief Justice of England, for reasons that need not be gone into here, denounced the proposed changes to the outside world in a scathing letter to the Lord Chancellor, which had in it the ring of the days of Ellesmere and Coke. The Bill of 1870 went down to the Commons; but it was proceeded with no further, and was not even re-introduced in 1871, although Lord Hatherley still held the seals. And the practitioners in the Courts, who had been much exercised in their minds as to their professional prospects in the event of the bill becoming law, had rest two whole years.

In November, 1872, on the retirement of Lord Hatherley, Sir Roundell Palmer became Lord Chancellor, and to his lot it fell—it

could not have fallen more appropriately to the lot of any man—to introduce in the ensuing session of Parliament a measure embodying the main recommendations of the Commission of 1867, of which he had been the prime mover. It is said that the draft of this measure, which ultimately became ‘The Judicature Act, 1873,’ was entirely the work of Lord Selborne’s own hand, and the masterly way in which it dealt with the subject furnishes a strong presumption of the truth of the rumour. Lord Selborne’s bill was free from the faults which had proved so disastrous to his immediate predecessor; it effectually consolidated the superior Courts into one, without disturbing the settled channels of business more than was absolutely necessary; it expressly declared the supremacy of the principles of equity, where they were in conflict with those of the Common Law, so as to prevent any future collision between them; and it prescribed a code of rules, founded on a simple and rational basis, for the practical guidance of the tribunal that it called into existence. The one point of attack that it presented was, that it proposed to abolish, once and for all, the judicial functions of the House of Lords, and to transfer them to a new Court of Appeal. It was found easy in certain quarters to turn this proposal into a political challenge, and to make it subserve party purposes, and so Lord Selborne’s bill, although it received the royal assent in August, 1873, was suspended in its operation until November, 1874, and was again suspended until November, 1875. The country has reason to congratulate itself that these suspensions took place, for in the interval Lord Selborne’s rules were expanded into a more complete code of procedure, prepared with the sanction of a select committee of judges, and dealing in an exhaustive manner with the various points likely to arise in practice. Last year it was the good fortune of Lord Cairns to place the coping stone on the new judicial edifice, by passing a supplemental Judicature Act, known as “The Judicature Act, 1875,” and containing, among other minor improvements, this amended code of procedure. At the same time he silenced further opposition in Parliament, by prolonging the continuance of the judicial power of the House of Peers until November, 1876; and the country will have shortly to determine whether there is to be any further respite. By the Act of 1875, the Tories took up and carried forward the work of their political opponents, who had thoroughly manured and tilled the ground, but there was no attendant party triumph to recall the adroitness with which some years before they had contrived to ‘dish the Whigs’ by outbidding them on the electoral question. The Acts of 1873 and 1875 make up between them one solid and consistent whole; and while the impartial historian will acknowledge the special services of their individual framers, he will divide the honours



between the two powers in the State without seeking to award the palm to either.

Before inquiring what the Judicature Acts have done for us, let us consider for a moment what it is they have not done. They have not brought about, nor were they intended to bring about, what is popularly termed a 'fusion of law and equity.' To have done this would have been to abolish trusts, and without trusts it would be impossible to adapt the devolution of property to the exigencies of modern civilised life. Every settlement of land or stock, and every disposition under which a married woman is protected against the extravagance or bankruptcy of her husband, avails itself of the machinery of trusts; and no system of registration of titles that has yet been devised ventures altogether to dispense with trusts. The distinction between the legal and the equitable ownership is, in these cases, perfectly natural, and is to be found in nearly all systems of jurisprudence that are worthy of the name. The special vice of the English system has been that this distinction was extended to cases where it was no longer natural, but on the contrary thoroughly artificial and irreconcilable with common sense. It was unnatural that a legal estate should become extinguished by union with another and greater legal estate, while no such extinction took place if both the estates were equitable only, or one was equitable and the other legal. It was unnatural that an assignment of a bond or other debt should be recognised in a Court of Equity, but not recognised in a Court of Common Law. It was unnatural that time should be of the essence of a contract if sued on at Westminster Hall, but not of the essence of the same contract if sued on at Lincoln's Inn; or that a tenant for life, under no legal restraint with regard to waste, should not be liable in damages for maliciously cutting down an ornamental avenue of trees, though, in equity, he might be prevented from lopping a single bough, if an injunction were applied for before the mischief was done. To these and other absurd refinements of the same kind, the Judicature Acts have put an end, but they have still left a clear domain of equity, separate and distinct from that of law, namely, the domain of trusts. In a word, they have not effected fusion, but they have effected concurrent administration. The terms 'law' and 'equity' will, however, be no longer used, as they have hitherto been, in opposition to each other, and the latter term will probably cease to be used at all, except in connection with the equitable estate. This will be owing to the fact that in both sections of the Supreme Court, namely, the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal, there is henceforth but a single set of ruling principles, and that in these Courts, for all administrative purposes, equity and law are one.

Equity and law are one under the Judicature Acts, but are they

one at the expense of law or at the expense of equity? The language of the Acts is plain that equity is to prevail, but what if those who administer law are not familiar with the equity that overrides it? While the Bill of 1873 was passing through Parliament these questions were repeated in various forms, and caused such nervous apprehension in the minds of practitioners in the Court of Chancery as ultimately to induce them to present a remonstrance to the Lord Chancellor. The *Saturday Review*, in one of a series of articles which have since been republished,<sup>1</sup> expressed itself in the same key: "Our complaint of the Bill is, that it destroys and does not construct, that it abolishes the old safeguards, rude, no doubt, but still efficient, without substituting any other safeguards to protect the highest portion of our law from gradual but certain deterioration." In fact it seems to have been thought that when the Court of Chancery was no more, the principles that had taken root there would die under transplantation, and that Lord Selborne having climbed to the summit of his ambition with the help of the ladder of equity was about to kick the ladder down on the pretence of making concessions to the common lawyers. These dismal forebodings were in great measure dispelled by Lord Selborne's speech on the third reading of his bill, and have been completely falsified by the experience of the last three months. Those who gave them utterance did not sufficiently foresee or consider (1) that business would, at the commencement of the transition period, follow its ancient lines, and that actions involving points of equity would not, as a rule, be set down for trial in those divisions of the High Court in which Common Law judges preside; (2) that the new system provides for and encourages a free interchange of judges between the different divisions; and (3) that the doctrines of equity are not after all so recondite and abstruse that they cannot be grasped by a judge of ability, assisted by a competent bar, whatever his early training may have been. It was a surprise to the profession when Sir George Mellish, an eminent Common Law advocate, was appointed a Lord Justice of the Court of Appeal in Chancery, but the appointment was a signal success, and no one ever suggested that equitable principles suffered at his hands. It was a greater surprise still when Mr. Baron Bramwell and Mr. Justice Brett, two ordinary judges of the old Common Law Courts, and therefore supposed to have no knowledge of equity, were lately summoned to assist at the deliberations of the new Court of Appeal, and to rehear cases decided by the Master of the Rolls and the Vice Chancellors; but here, again, the selection has been amply justified by the result. Without enumerating other instances in which eminent lawyers now living are doing good judicial work in a sphere not naturally their own, it will suffice to say that

(1) "Thoughts on Fusion of Law and Equity." By G. W. Hemming, Q.C.

the late Lord Cranworth was all the greater equity judge for having been also Baron of the Exchequer, and that Lord Eldon himself was Chief Justice of the Common Pleas before he presided with such extraordinary power and learning over the old Court of Chancery.

There is one other change in the organic judicial structure which it will be convenient to notice here, namely, the abolition of the Court of Exchequer Chamber. The composition of that Court of intermediate appeal was, at all events in modern times, highly unsatisfactory. Its original design was, that the decision of the Court below, on the legal points reserved at the first trial, should be reviewed by the entire body of Common Law judges, excluding only those who had been present at the previous hearing. When the Court, so formed, was a full one, and unanimous, its judgments carried with them very considerable weight. But, in practice, the Court seldom comprised more than five or six members, and this combination was based upon convenience rather than upon special fitness. The result was that a strong judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench, consisting perhaps of some five judges, was liable to be reversed in the Exchequer Chamber by a majority of three judges over two, chosen at random from the Common Pleas and the Exchequer, and similarly the Exchequer judges were liable to be overruled by a narrow majority of the Queen's Bench and Common Pleas. Such a system of compensation, however fair and even as between the judges, who alternately lost and won by the arrangement, could not commend itself to the unfortunate suitor with but a single cause to be tried. The special, if not the only, advantage of this ingenious contrivance was, that it saved the salaries of extra appellate judges; its disadvantages were, that it unsettled instead of settling the law, caused disappointment and vexation to the litigant, and, by taking too many of the judges of first instance away from their proper work, delayed the progress of public business. It is unlikely that, amongst the most bigoted worshippers of our constitutional forms, any one will be found to drop a tear over the extinction of the Exchequer Chamber, and its merger in the new Court of Appeal.

It would not be fitting to attempt, in these pages, to describe minutely the practice of the new Judicature, or to dwell at length on its superiority over the system it has superseded. To do this would necessitate the use of professional terms, which I desire as far as possible to avoid, and would require a far larger measure of space than I could venture to occupy. I shall, therefore, only touch lightly on four salient points; (1) the new mode of commencing an action; (2) the new pleadings or methods of determining what are the real issues between the parties; (3) the evidence by which those issues may be supported; (4) the several forms of trial.

I. All 'actions' (and there are no longer any 'suits') are now commenced by a writ of summons, which is required to state in a few simple words, for the information of the opposite party, what is the nature of the complaint made, or relief sought, against him. This is at once an innovation upon the more recent practice and a partial restitution of an older order of things. Four-and-twenty years ago the initiatory writ at law was bound to declare, though it often did so in language nearly unintelligible, the nature of the redress asked for, the reason of this rule being that there were only fixed forms of writs, and those limited in number, within one or other of which the plaintiff's grievance must be brought, or he could not sue at all. In order to obviate this injustice, and with it to get rid of a good deal of absurd jargon that so darkened the threshold of the dispute as to prevent the plaintiff from clearly seeing his way into it, or the defendant from finding his way out, the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, allowed writs to be issued without a word of explanation as to what the party issuing them really wanted. The intention was good, namely, to make the system more elastic, but the effort to be brief rendered the cause of action obscure. The practice of the Court of Chancery was open to still graver objections, for there the plaintiff's first step was to serve his opponent with a more or less prolix document called a 'bill,' and, if the case was one for an immediate injunction, to follow the bill up by another document almost precisely in the same words, called an 'affidavit in support.' Thus the defendant, even if willing to confess himself in the wrong, had no opportunity of striking his colours except at the risk of having to pay a large sum for costs, and many a suit commenced in this way has been continued for the purpose of adjusting the burden of the costs, long after the subject matter had ceased to exist. The framers of the new code of procedure, profiting by the experience that nearly 70 per cent. of the litigation in England (I advisedly say nothing of Scotland or Wales) is amicably arranged almost as soon as it is commenced, have steered a middle course between these opposite extremes, and have wisely prescribed that the nature of the claim to be made, and of the relief or remedy demanded, shall be clearly and concisely indorsed on the writ of summons, without requiring that it shall be cast in any stereotyped mould.

II. After the writ of summons come the pleadings. And here we approach what was once a great mystery, almost as great as that in which the patrician order at Rome enveloped the *formule* of actions until they were divulged by the theft of the scribe Flavius. Obviously the best system of pleading is that which elicits, in the shortest and most convenient form, the material issues of fact to which the law has to be applied, and thus puts each party in complete possession of the

points to which his evidence should be addressed. Any method that stops short of this enables one party to spring a surprise on the other at the trial, and any method that goes beyond it cumbers the record with irrelevant matter. In either case there is risk of a miscarriage of justice: in the first, because the party surprised may be unable, for want of preparation, to parry his adversary's attack; in the second, because juries are apt to lose sight of the real issue when false or collateral issues are presented along with it. The old common lawyers were so impressed with the first half of these truths, that they entirely forgot the second half; and the art of special pleading seems to have been invented expressly for the purpose of widening the area of dispute, instead of confining it within its proper bounds. As children are given fragments of coloured glass in a kaleidoscope, out of which they make new combinations by turning it round, so the special pleaders, taking to pieces a simple money transaction, and resolving it into all its possible elements, presented it to view in a distracting variety of shapes under the denomination of 'common counts.' These common counts, originating with the plaintiff, gave rise to as many different 'pleas' on the part of the defendant; and thus, if one may be allowed a sudden change of metaphor, an intricate web was spun, by the ingenuity of the lawyers, in which the client would have failed to recognise a single thread of his own, if he had taken the trouble to look into it. For a long time, too, neither party could enforce, at Common Law, admissions from his opponent, but was forced to resort for them to the Court of Chancery, where they were indigenous to the soil. It is true that in 1854 interrogatories were allowed to be administered with the leave of the Common Law judge, but the innovation was hampered with inconvenient restrictions, and was after all but an imperfect engine of discovery. To borrow a comparison from the able writer already referred to,<sup>1</sup> an action at law was carried on much on the same principle as a game of whist, where each side does his best to conceal his hand from the other, whilst a suit in equity was managed like a game of chess, or, if you will, whist with double dummy. There can be little doubt that, as a means of shortening litigation, by informing each party beforehand of the strength and weakness of his adversary's case, the Equity method of pleading was the superior; but it had the great defect of suffering what was technically called the 'discovery' to be mixed up and entangled with the 'defence,' and both to be presented together in a single document called the 'answer.' The new Rules of Procedure have untied this knot—a knot which the skilful draftsman strove to make as tight as possible—and discovery and defence are now kept apart from each other, while the pleading on both sides

(1) *Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1875; "Judicial Investigation of Truth."

is reduced to a simple narrative of facts, concluding with the claim for the particular remedy to which the party speaking considers himself entitled. Ample opportunity is afforded for amendment, both before and at the trial, when the justice of the case demands it, and the plaintiff is allowed the last word; but unless fresh ground has been broken by the defendant, and made the foundation of a counter-claim, that word is merely of a formal character, and, when uttered, closes the pleadings.

III. As the end of good pleading is to bring out the points of agreement and difference, and thereby to narrow the controversy, so the end of a fair trial is to determine, by proper evidence, on which side the truth lies. If it had been asked under the old *régime* what was *proper evidence*—meaning thereby evidence furnished by human testimony, as distinguished from that furnished by documents—the answer to the question would have depended on the Court in which it was put. The reply in the late Court of Chancery would have been, that evidence was proper if contained in the affidavit of some person conversant with the facts deposed to, provided only that the deposition was in other respects receivable, and that there had been an opportunity of cross-examining upon it. In a Court of Common Law we should have been told, that such affidavit evidence was very nearly worthless, and that the only proper mode of proceeding was to put the witness into the box, and get him to tell his story first-hand, in the presence of the judge and jury, who could observe his demeanour, and draw their conclusions from it. The latter answer is plainly the more correct of the two, and no one familiar with the practice of the Court of Chancery will deny that the system of evidence countenanced there was about as bad as it could be. In that Court, oral examination in chief before the Court itself was almost unknown, although, owing to certain modern Acts of Parliament, it was not wholly excluded; and cross-examination, even in hostile cases, could not, until quite recent times, be conducted under the eye of the Chancery judge who had to decide the cause. By a general order of Court of the year 1861, when either party desired to cross-examine a witness, the party, whose witness he was, was required to produce him for that purpose at the trial; but this order only applied to a limited class of suits, and left it optional to a plaintiff, by proceeding in a particular manner, technically called ‘moving for a decree,’ to screen all his witnesses from judicial scrutiny, and to force the cause on for trial, supported by printed or written evidence only. In the hands of an unscrupulous litigant, this worked considerable mischief, for it was often easy to manufacture an affidavit or deposition that would stand the test even of severe cross-examination when the result only appeared on paper. To reproduce the unwillingness and the hesitation of a witness is not possible

to a shorthand writer, and it was certainly never attempted by either of the two amiable gentlemen before whom, as the official examiners of the Court, Chancery cross-examinations had to be conducted. Then again, even when the witnesses were honest, their affidavits often disguised, if they did not pervert the facts, owing to the mode of their production. An attorney's clerk would be sent down to an illiterate man or woman to ascertain what they knew of this or that matter, and, as a consequence of the interview, a string of statements would be jotted down more or less relevant to the questions to be tried. These statements would then be transcribed and submitted to counsel, with instructions to turn them into an affidavit, and this he did by bringing out prominently all the favourable portions of them, and throwing all the unfavourable ones into the background. Not unfrequently he would make a suggestion that possibly the witness would be able to depose to some further fact bearing on the case, which appeared to him to have been forgotten, and he appended provisionally another sentence or two, with the remark that the witness should be seen again, and that, if true, it should be introduced into his deposition. It was commonly found that human nature was too weak to resist so powerful a temptation, and that if the witness's memory was not really quickened by the suggestion, he managed to persuade himself that it was. The opposing counsel, having no means of judging from perusal of the completed document what was within the certain knowledge of the deponent, and what was merely his hazy recollection or belief, often abstained from cross-examining on this interpolated matter, lest the answer should strengthen his adversary's case. It may be added that the witness, having usually got his affidavit by heart before he came up for cross-examination, would probably not have been substantially shaken if the experiment had been tried. In not a few instances—though the practice was never approved of—affidavits have been prepared without any sufficient materials, on the chance that the witness would "swear up to the mark;" and it being notorious that prosecutions for perjury, even where directed by a judge, very rarely end in a verdict of guilty, the mark has been often sworn up to accordingly. In non-contested cases, or where the parties agree to it, there can of course be no objection to affidavit evidence; and therefore the Judicature Act provides that, under those conditions, it may be resorted to. Thus, all that is good in the Chancery system is preserved, while much useless expense is saved, by its being no longer imperative on the suitor, as it formerly was at Common Law, to summon his witnesses from a distance to prove facts lying outside the field of actual contest.

IV. It remains to say a few words on the several forms of trial. These are now considerably multiplied so as to be capable of easy adaptation to almost any phase of the litigation. The Acts carefully

preserve the right of every litigant to have his cause submitted, as a whole, by the judge to the jury, with a proper and complete direction both as to the law and the evidence ; but at the same time they recognise the truth that there are many subsidiary parts of a case that cannot be conveniently dealt with in this old constitutional fashion. Not only are there questions of law which have to be disengaged from the facts and first determined by the judge ; but there are many questions of fact which are not proper to be submitted to a jury at all. For example the facts, and the conclusions to be drawn from them, may hinge, not on actual events or phenomena falling within the range of the senses, but on a general course of mercantile dealing, or the special usage of a trade ; and then they cannot well be determined without a knowledge of that course of dealing, or the usage of that particular trade. Sometimes they involve complicated inquiries into mere matters of account, and it is easy to see that in these and like instances, to bring into play the machinery of a judge and jury would be a useless waste of public time. Under the old system, there were many contrivances for disposing of this class of questions, and each Court adopted that one which seemed right in its own eyes. In the Court of Chancery, matters of account were referred to the judge at chambers, that is, practically to the chief clerk ; in the Courts of Common Law, references went to the master, or, where the parties so agreed, to private arbitration, the arbitrator being usually a barrister, or a lay expert whose ignorance of law was supposed to be counterbalanced by his special knowledge on other points. It would be difficult to exaggerate the inconveniences with which this last kind of reference was attended. In the first place arbitration was seldom resorted to until the trial had actually commenced and all the costs of it had been incurred, including even the fee on the counsel's brief. Towards the end of an assize, it was not uncommon to see a dozen heavy actions so dealt with, to the surprise of no one engaged in them except the parties themselves, who naturally failed to comprehend why their cases were so summarily shunted. It is to be hoped they abstained from following them further, for what with adjournments to suit everybody's convenience, half or quarter days of work, documents and witnesses not forthcoming when wanted, and a hundred other irregularities, due to the absence of judicial control and the wholesome check of public opinion, these arbitrations, when they once began, threatened never to come to an end. The result was an enormous increase of costs, to say nothing of risk of miscarriage in the award, and if miscarriage there were, it was irretrievable ; for an award does not admit of an appeal, unless there is error on the face of it, or the arbitrator has been guilty of personal misconduct. The Judicature Acts have not abrogated these references to arbitrations, but have



placed them on a higher platform, by calling into existence a new class of functionaries called Official Referees, who are directed to hold their sittings *de die in diem*, and are clothed with all the authority of judges of the High Court, except the power of committal to prison. The Official Referee is not bound, as the private arbitrator was, to complete the Reference as a whole, irrespective of the difficulties that may have arisen in the course of it; but he is at liberty to break it off and submit any incidental question for the decision of the Court, or to state any facts specially, in order that the Court may draw its own inferences from them. The Court may also require any explanation or reasons from the referee, and remit to him the whole, or any part, of his 'findings' for reconsideration and revision. Should the parties prefer it, they may choose their own referee, and so withdraw themselves from the jurisdiction of the permanent officer; the person so agreed on (called a special referee) being invested by the Acts with all the powers and duties of the official referee.

There is one other office created by the Acts in connection with the Supreme Court which has hitherto been only known in connection with the Admiralty and the County Courts, namely, the office of Assessor. Whenever a reference was made to the Registrar of the Court of Admiralty, he had power to call in competent merchants and other skilled persons to assist him in the inquiry; and when, in the year 1868, a limited Admiralty jurisdiction was conferred on certain County Courts, the judges of those Courts were authorised to summon to their aid nautical persons acquainted with maritime subjects. In the following year, by an amending Act, the County Court judges were empowered to call in mercantile assessors; but owing to this Act having been framed under a misconception, the power has been very sparingly, if ever, exercised. It is by no means clear as yet what will be the precise functions of the assessors of the Supreme Court, or how they will be selected, the rules of procedure being silent on these points; but their business will be not only to assist the judges, when required, but the referees also, whether official or special; and the remuneration, both of referees and assessors, is to be determined by the Court employing them. Both classes of officers have been long known on the Continent, referees or experts for the investigation of special facts being distinctly recognised by the Hamburg law, and commercial assessors having been established at Frankfort many years before it ceased to be a free state.

There is still another important provision of the new Acts which may appropriately be noticed here, viz., the formation of district registries in immediate connection with the Supreme Court. It was unquestionably a hardship to compel all actions which did not fall

within the County Court jurisdiction to be commenced in London, when both parties were residing or carrying on business in the same country town. For the mechanical process of issuing the writ, or of entering up judgment in default of the appearance of the defendant, a local office, where the proceedings can be recorded, is obviously as good as a London one, and it is very much cheaper. Hitherto every country solicitor has had a London agent by whom all his business in the superior Courts has been transacted, and who has shared the clients' fees with him. Large fortunes have been accumulated by many a metropolitan firm whose principal employment has been that of an intermediary only; and, in former times, the support of what was called a large agency house has been the making of many a barrister, and has accelerated his promotion to the bench. Business is now dispersed through a greater number of channels, so that the old professional monopolies no longer assume such gigantic proportions. The establishment of district registries will, though not to any very considerable extent, further curtail the employment of these agents; but if there is to be uniformity in the law, and a great and central bar, it would be impossible wholly to dispense with them, and we must become thoroughly disintegrated and provincialised before they cease to exist. The Judicature Acts have, in this respect, been very cautiously and discreetly framed. When either of the parties resides outside the limited area prescribed by the Acts, the proceedings, down to notice of trial, can only go on within that area with the consent of both litigants; and even when both reside within the same area, there are great facilities for removing the action to London, if a judge should think fit so to order. Except that local venues are abolished, the trial of the action will, for the most part, take place where it took place before, without reference to the district registry in which the preliminary proceedings have been had.

Disguise the fact as we Londoners may, it is obvious that there is a powerful body of persons at work who are striving to break up our judicial framework, and to decentralise the legal profession, under the plausible plea that law should be cheap, and should be administered near every man's door. Those who are of this opinion are apt to forget that cheap law encourages litigation, and that when law is home-made its quality is seldom first-rate. It is natural that localised judges and provincial solicitors should persuade themselves that the County Courts might be made legal centres for commercial administration, and that he who can be entrusted to decide a dispute involving fifty pounds can, as safely, be trusted to decide upon thousands. But is the country prepared to have its large commercial questions decided in a dozen different ways by a dozen different tribunals? All law is bad that is uncertain, or rather

uncertain law is no law; and without a controlling power and the fittest intellects to wield it, our law, which for want of a code is already obscure enough, would soon become a chaos. The integrity of our judges is beyond suspicion, but if they were all fixed in certain spots, and attended by local barristers and solicitors only, who can say what influences might not be brought to bear upon them—influences which they themselves would not be conscious of, just as the weakest of them are not conscious now of the spell that an able advocate, with whose manner and tone they have become pleasantly familiar, succeeds in weaving around them? The conception of English Law as the image of Justice is dear to the hearts of the bulk of the people of England; and the embodiment of that conception, whether viewed from its civil or its criminal side, should have something of majesty about it.

The introduction into our legal system of the several new elements already indicated; the facilities now given for joining together several causes of action and for admitting counter-claims; the power conferred on the judges to settle issues, where not clearly defined by the parties themselves; the extension of the special indorsement on the writ which has been found so useful for bills of exchange; in a word, the equipping of every division of the High Court with all the judicial appliances that have proved valuable anywhere, will, it is hoped, pacify those members of the community who have for some time past been clamouring for tribunals of commerce, including even Mr. Ayrton, who stands at their head. Judging from the evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, which reported in 1871, Mr. Ayrton and his mercantile friends are not yet agreed amongst themselves as to the composition of the tribunals that they are prepared to recommend, or the class of cases that should come before them. They are not agreed whether the judges should be wholly commercial, as in France and Belgium, or partly commercial and partly legal, as in many of the German states; whether the commercial members should be paid or not for their services, whether the tribunals should be exclusive of, or concurrent with, that of the superior Courts, whether they should be bound by the settled rules of evidence, or should admit as evidence whatever appears to them to be material, whether there should or should not be an appeal to a regularly constituted legal Court. For example, amongst the witnesses examined, Mr. Morris, the President of the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, stated that he should personally prefer that the new tribunal should be on a purely voluntary footing, like the Committee of the Stock Exchange or Lloyds, "thus offering to litigants the power of escaping litigation "by referring it to men honest and anxious to come to a speedy "opinion, with their knowledge derived from a fellow feeling with

"the two parties." The Chairman of the Bradford Chamber differed *in toto* from Mr. Morris, and, so far from wishing to use the new Courts merely as instruments of voluntary arbitration, desired that they should be complete Courts of first instance, with exclusive and compulsory jurisdiction, though liable to be appealed from on purely legal questions. In fact, he wished for an extension of the existing County Courts with a special commercial department superadded, that should be unfettered by any pecuniary limit. Other witnesses were for making the jurisdiction compulsory, but only in the case where one of the parties insisted on it, leaving it optional to them to have the cause tried by the Superior Court, if both were willing to indulge in the luxury. And so throughout the entire blue book, *quot homines tot sententie*. How the Committee managed, in face of this evidence, to issue an unanimous report, it is difficult to understand; and their final proposal to appoint "commercial judges whose office, like that of a justice of the peace, should be regarded as an "honourable duty, not as a service of emolument" does not strike one as very practical, or consistent with our experience of the requirements of business men. Most law reformers of the present day are endeavouring to get rid of our one unpaid magistracy, that composed of clergymen and country squires, and to attempt to establish another of a wholly commercial character appears to be little short of preposterous.

It must not be inferred from what has been said that the new system is without blemishes, or that it will not require careful handling to insure its working smoothly. Already some of the rules of procedure have failed to stand the criticism brought to bear upon them, but no flaw has yet been discovered that cannot be easily repaired. One thing seems likely, that the existing staff of judges will prove inadequate to the task that they are required to get through, and this more especially in the Chancery Division, where the greater part of the evidence has now to be taken *ricà voce* in open court. Some of the Common Law judges (I use the term for convenience merely) are already beginning to complain of the excessive friction that attends their labours under the Acts, and of the diversified parts that they are called upon to fill at the shortest possible notice. But friction is an accompaniment of all new machinery, and every fresh experience on the bench increases the power of those who preside there, and adds to the confidence which they inspire. It can, however, be hardly necessary that so much continuous exertion should be required of the judges as is involved in their having to endure a sitting, like that now in progress, of thirteen weeks without a break. Few minds are strong enough to bear so severe a strain, and, unless both bench and bar are in full vigour, business may go on but it does not progress. Any one who has had practical

experience of our Courts knows how the trial of a heavy cause may be reduced within a comparatively narrow compass when the judge, before whom it is opened, has a rapid perception of the real points on which it turns, and how the speeches of counsel and evidence of witnesses may be curtailed by a timely intimation from the Court of what is, and what is not, relevant matter. If all sittings are to be as protracted as that which commenced on the 11th of last month, one of two things must happen; either we must have more judges, or public business will begin to drag and the quality of the work of the Judicial Bench will, with rare exceptions, deteriorate.

These difficulties may be easily arranged, as involving no important principle; but there are two other questions of greater moment, intimately connected with our Judicature, to which Parliament will have to address itself early in the ensuing session. The first of these—the appointment of one or more Public Prosecutors—has been agitated for upwards of twenty years, and has been the subject of no less than five abortive bills, the last of which was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Bruce in 1873, and was withdrawn for want of time to proceed with it effectually. Every one is agreed that, when a crime has been committed, it ought not to be left to the individual injured to bring the criminal to justice; not only because a crime is an offence against the State, but because a State which declines to interfere by prosecuting criminals to conviction cannot adequately discharge its duty as protector of the lives and properties of its subjects. So long as the prosecution of offenders is left in private hands, crimes which ought to be severely punished are likely to be condoned, and the condonation of a crime often acts as an encouragement to the criminal to repeat his former experiment on a larger scale. Even when a private citizen takes the trouble to put the law in motion, although he may have nothing to gain by it, his prosecution often fails for want of adequate funds, or defective knowledge either on his own part, or on the part of those he employs. In civil causes this is inevitable, for we are all liable to disappointments, owing to the carelessness or incompetency of our agents; but the State has a right to be served efficiently, and by the prizes it is able to offer can always insure that it shall be. At present the duty of getting up prosecutions is, in the first instance, entrusted to the police, and they it is who communicate with the witnesses, and put the evidence into shape. It is no disparagement to them to say that they do this part of their work only too well, and that innocent men have sometimes suffered from their *trop de zèle*. Moreover, the police are not infrequently the most important witnesses at the trial, and a prosecutor who is also a witness is apt to be biased, even when he desires to be honest. It is a mere accident that the committing magistrates' clerks also act as

public prosecutors up to a certain point. Their services in that capacity are occasional merely, and very ill-requested, and there have been many cases of importance in which they have failed to instruct counsel for the prosecution at the assizes, because it was not worth their while to prepare his brief or advance his fee.

The only instances of State prosecutions arising out of private injuries occur when, as in a late celebrated case turning wholly on circumstantial evidence, the Government interferes on account of their peculiar gravity, and then the action of the Government is determined by popular rumour, rather than by legal authority, and is wholly dependent on the will of the Lords of the Treasury. There is no danger in England of our public prosecutors becoming invested with inquisitorial powers, like those of the *ministère public* in France, or of their modelling their indictments on the French *actes d'accusation*, which not only recapitulate all the grounds from which the guilt of the accused may be inferred, but also refute by anticipation the arguments for the defence. The difficulty of the measure lies, not in its principle, but in its administrative details, and it is, therefore, exactly the kind of problem which the Conservatives undertook to solve when they last came into office.

The other question which must be discussed next session, and finally disposed of, is the question whether there is to be a second appeal in civil cases, and what the nature of that appeal is to be. The House of Lords, unless willing to submit to reform, can hardly maintain its ground, as the tribunal of ultimate resort, beyond the autumn of this year; for at present it is disfigured by shams, and we are fast learning to exchange shams for realities. That there should be an opportunity for a second appeal, I, for one, sincerely believe; but half the value of the appeal is thrown away if the judgment delivered gives forth an uncertain sound. That half-a-dozen law-peers should pretend to be the House of Lords, and that we should all agree to call them so, is plainly contrary to common sense; that, being all of them ex-judges, except the one who for the time being is the Chief Judge of the land, they should deliver their judgments in the deliberative, instead of the judicial style, would be intolerable but that the singularity of the form is usually redeemed by the broad wisdom that pervades and animates the substance. The mischief of these so-called *speeches* is, that those uttered by the minority get cited as authorities, as well as those uttered by the majority, though, in fact, neither the one nor the other are commanding expositions of the law, nor, except so far as they lead up directly to the final decision, are they binding on the subordinate courts. Differences of opinion often exist amongst the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and these differences find free expression in the course of the cases heard before them, but the judg-

ment delivered is as the voice of one man, and not a discordant note is heard in it. If the rule were otherwise, these imperial appeals would soon cease to satisfy our colonies and dependencies; as happily they now do; just as any other manifesto of the Crown, if it bore the marks of indecision, would inevitably breed disaffection and distrust. It was right that the members of the old Exchequer Chamber should openly state their individual conclusions, and even reply upon one another in the course of delivering judgment; for the benefit of the discussion would have been lost if these conclusions had not been put in a shape in which they could be reviewed by the Court above. But the strength of the House of Lords, as a Court of ultimate appeal, is seriously impaired by the public exhibition of divided and distracted counsels; and it is peculiarly illogical that the members of such a Court should be openly arrayed against each other, when the theory is that they are bound by all the decisions of their predecessors, and that their own decisions are in their turn infallible, and can only be altered by the intervention of the entire body of the legislature. It is a minor grievance that the House of Lords is not accessible during the prorogation of Parliament, for the judicial arrears there are never very considerable; but whilst we are promoting, by every means in our power, the dispatch of business in the superior Courts, it is an anomaly to brook delay in the highest Court of all. As a second legislative chamber the House of Lords is of immense and increasing value to the State; but its present judicial position is a mere 'survival' of past ages, and adds nothing to its dignity or its permanence. It has been frequently admonished that this excrescence must be pared away, or made conformable to modern requirements; the time has fully come for it to show how far it has profited by the warning.

MONTAGUE COOKSON.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE past month has brought no modification in the state of the East. Austria persists with admirable patience in trying to untie the Gordian knot which no one dares to propose to cut. At St. Petersburg, Vienna, and Constantinople, however, they are simply marking time : everybody is excessively vigilant and rather distrustful. Count Andrassy's Note on the reforms which ought to be required from the Porte has travelled very slowly, only reaching its destination a fortnight after beginning its journey. It has been duly examined by the cabinets. Russia, Prussia, France, and Italy all approve it. England after some hesitation also supports it, because her abstention would encourage inopportune resistance in Turkey. The difficulty of course is not to trace a programme, but to assure its execution. For this, as everybody sees, the intervention of the great powers, under one form or another, is indispensable. But what form of intervention will be really efficacious, and at the same time such as Turkey can accept?

Even Lord Stratford de Redcliffe admits that the execution of the reforms should be superintended by a commission composed of the representatives of the great powers. But would this be enough? Two difficulties present themselves at the first glance. In a commission containing persons with different or hostile interests, agreement in action is not easy; it is only to be secured by abstaining from action. Moreover, the iniquities which are to be brought to an end, are perpetrated in remote districts where the government of Constantinople itself has little means of exerting effective pressure. For some time past circumstances have been remarked on all sides that unmistakably indicate a complete disorganization of the body politic. In Roumelia and Bulgaria, though these are not insurgent provinces, bands of Turks, often of Bushi-Bazouks, make their way into the farmsteads, outrage the women, carry off all that is worth taking, and slay or burn the unhappy peasants. Atrocities of the same sort are committed even at the very doors of Constantinople. When soldiers who represent the government, thus set an example of pillage and assassination, what means has authority got left for restoring order? In vain you decree the equality of Christians and Mussulmans. It will be a dead letter. Those who are best informed declare positively that such reforms will never be put into practice or respected, until they are imposed by an iron hand. Just in proportion as the poverty of the Treasury grows worse, will the disorganization grow more general. The officials, no longer drawing their salaries regularly, will no longer fulfil their duties. The soldiers, no longer receiving their pay, will plunder the rayahs, like the lanzknechts of the middle ages. The provincial governors, to obtain a greater return from the taxes, will exact larger tithes, and by so doing will ruin agriculture. *Abyssus abyssum vocat.* Oppression produces misery, and extreme misery leads to depopulation. This is the way in which Spain lost half of her population. How many tears and how much ruin are represented by the interest on Turkish loans that has been recently



paid to the creditors! No civilized country can lend its aid, direct or indirect, in maintaining such a system.

From this vicious circle the only way of escape is foreign intervention, and, to Austria alone, as is justly repeated again and again, can this mission be entrusted. If there is any government which ought to be the heir of the sick man it is Austria. Austria is the only great power whose confines touch those of Turkey. Already she has on her territory a part of the populations that occupy the neighbouring regions, Roumanians, Serbs, Croats, Bosniacs,—in such a way that ethnological sympathies, whose influence is incessantly growing stronger, are one day sure to force on one side or another the reünion of members that the chance of events disjoined. The reconstitution of nationalities has causes so deep that nothing can hinder its accomplishment. The nationality of the Southern Slavs will one day reconstitute itself either under the auspices of Austria, or else on its ruins. Prince Bismarck has said on this subject a simple and profound thing that describes the entire situation: The centre of gravity of Austria will be displaced eastwards. The mission of Austria is in her name, *Ost Reich*, the eastern empire. Since Count Andrassy has traced the plan of the reforms to be sought from the Porte, it is to him that the task of supervision naturally falls. To urge and sustain him in this path is what England and Germany ought to do; their interests here are identical. For good policy, statesmen ought to act in the direction of events that must be brought to pass by the plain force of circumstances. Bismarck and Cavour did great things, because they made themselves the instruments of that mighty idea which carries all before it in our time—the constitution of nationalities. No doubt, neither Count Andrassy nor the Hungarians desire intervention in Turkey. But let them think of the future. If they thrust from them all responsibility for Ottoman affairs, Russia will sooner or later be drawn on to act, and if she succeeds, Austria is lost. Supported by Germany and England, she has nothing to fear.

Can we also count upon France? There is some ground for doubt. Our newspapers have recently made advances towards the adoption of a common policy by invoking the memories of the Crimean war. These advances have been rather contemptuously repulsed. They have been met in some such words as these:—"We have carried on policy *à la française* quite long enough; that is to say, policy for other people. Let us now take to policy *à l'anglaise*, that is to say, policy for ourselves." Nothing could be more desirable. France has no vital interest engaged in eastern affairs. She has very good reasons for not plunging gratuitously into them. But it is a curious illusion, and one that has become universal in France, to suppose that the French took part in the Crimean war to give pleasure to England. Napoleon III. would make war for an idea, but for a Napoleonic idea only, not an English idea. If he sought an alliance with England, it was only because in this way he was procuring admission—he, an adventurer who had climbed to power by crime—into the circle of European sovereigns; because in this way he was restoring her prestige to France, and satisfying an army that had raised him to the throne. The Crimean expedition was not made in an English, but in a dynastic, interest.

Independently of the oriental complications that bind her so closely, Austria finds herself also struggling with domestic difficulties. Annual deficits have accumulated until a loan has become necessary. A still graver thing—the union of Austria and Hungary—the dualism conceived by Deak—seems threatened in connection with the revision of treaties of commerce. Hungary insists that she was sacrificed in that compromise, and was made to bear an unfairly large share of debt. She is against protective duties, and claims the concession of financial preferences, threatening in case of non-compliance, to restore the customs line that divided the two countries in old days. The Austrians are indignant at these exaggerated demands and threats. Better, they say, personal union, than new concessions.

Personal union used to be the programme of the Hungarian opposition. But the Hungarians ought carefully to avoid anything that can weaken the Dual Empire, for assuredly it is they who have now the upper hand, and in case of any dislocation they would see themselves confronted by a Slav and Rouman majority which they would find it troublesome to hold in. At present, they lean upon the Cisleithan Germans, who are the root of their strength. Left to themselves, they would sooner or later become subordinate to the other nationalities, which are already superior to them in numbers, which are developing, and which are learning to look to neighbouring populations of the same origin. The Hungarians have a great part to play in the east, if they know how to understand it. Egoism will ruin them; devotion to the development of the other nationalities will save and magnify them. Sooner or later, by the influence of railways, by the spread of knowledge, by the growth of wealth, the various Slav and Rouman groups will acquire more power, and will incline to form a union according to their ethnographical affinities. It is for the Hungarians to direct this great movement of transformation. If they insist on opposing it, it will assuredly crush them.

Elections are about to take place in Spain; but it is impossible to feel any great interest in the electoral struggle. The result is foreseen. Every Spanish government that appeals to the electors, invariably obtains an overwhelming majority. Nowhere, not even in imperial France, has the art of making people vote according to the wishes of the ministry in power been pushed further than in Spain. Only this factitious majority is no sooner arrived at Madrid, than it falls to pieces, and overturns the ministry by whose means it was elected. Castelar publishes a long and eloquent electoral manifesto. It is extremely sensible, and shows that Castelar has profited by the lessons of experience. At bottom, the ideal which he used to defend, that of a federal republic, seems to be perfectly adapted to Spain. Notwithstanding the incessant efforts of centralised despotism to establish a unity like that of France, Spain has always remained a federation of provinces. Provincialism, or—to use the German phrase—Particularism, is in this country more full of life, more deeply rooted, more abundant in contrasts and oppositions, than it is either in Germany or in Switzerland. It is provincialism that maintains the struggle in the north under the flag of Don Carlos. Each province has its dialect, its manners, its traditions, its distinct

interests. They all live an independent life ; they do not feel themselves touched by one another's agitations. The whole south is free from any trouble about the civil war that rages in the north. Business does not suffer. The traffic on the railways is as active. The whole machinery of trade works as if all were peaceful. If each province could have assured to it an autonomy like that which is enjoyed by the Swiss cantons, then Spain would have a constitution in accord with her history, as well as with her present character, and so might enjoy order and liberty.

What ruins Spain is centralisation, and the relics which she is bent on preserving of the greatness of old time—first, Madrid, secondly, Cuba. It is Madrid, that centre of political intrigue and parasitic corruption, that relieving office for *déclassés* without resources—Madrid, that city born in a desert, against the design of nature, and by the malign action of despotism—it is Madrid that devours the revenues of the provinces, and gives them back in return only confusion and revolution. What is needed is to deprive the capital of its preponderance, by restoring to the provinces the greater portion of those duties and public rights of which the central power has laid hold. Evidently such a transformation can only be brought about gradually and in time of peace. During the agitated days that Castelar passed in power, it was impossible for him to busy himself in administrative reforms ; but it is these reforms, with decentralisation for their aim, that the party of the federal republic ought to pursue. They have seen clearly that under a centralised system, the republic cannot exist ; it succumbed less by the force of its enemies than by its own weakness and lack of vital force.

In the middle ages Spain was covered by small independent states, which were genuine republics, as the Navarrese provinces are to this day. Under this system, Spain was free, prosperous, happy, and it is exactly such a system that her statesmen ought to strain every nerve to restore. If Italy has shown an immediate fitness for constitutional government and modern liberties, it is because, thanks to her division into different states, local life had preserved great strength at Florence, Milan, Turin, Bologna, Naples, Palermo, Messina. It is well to establish political unity in order to bind up the various provinces that form a nationality ; but it is a fatal error to strip them of their peculiar life and native originality.

Montalembert has shown in a recently-published paper that Spain was long prosperous and free. The Spaniards, he says, were brave and industrious, so long as they were unshackled by masters. But Spain has been destroyed by the association of two despotisms—the despotism of the Church, and the despotism of kings. Intolerance, the Inquisition, and tyrannical centralisation, drove out Moors, Jews, and Protestants ; killed industry, stifled thought, depopulated the land. Never has a clearer, a more terrible lesson been given to man. Never has it been more unmistakably seen how a nation is undone when it once allows itself to be robbed of its freedom. Never has decay been more profound, more swift. Only the Ottoman Empire offers a similar sight. No doubt it is not dogma that Montalembert accuses ; the doctrine that he charges with ruining Spain and threatening the future of France is Vaticanism. Though intolerance and the Inquisition have destroyed Spain, the Spanish bishops in the

pending elections deliberately place only one object before their partisans : to restore these very things. This is what their electoral circular (January 10) says :—" Freedom of worship is condemned by propositions 77, 78, and 79 of the Syllabus of the immortal pontiff, Pius IX. : no Catholic, therefore, can vote for this mischievous freedom, nor send to the Cortes men who have resolved to establish it in Spain. It is our duty to direct all our legal action to keeping out of the Assembly and the Senate those who cherish any such design." As the Syllabus is in truth universal, it follows that all over the world the Church persecutes freedom of worship. And Lord Acton will still say that Rome does not interfere in temporal things.

Another embarrassment which Spain has inherited from her vanished greatness are the colonies of the Antilles. They are a heavy burden for her, a root of ruin, a perpetual source of danger. If the Spanish Government had been free to devote to the repression of war at home, the men and money that are sent away every year to Cuba, there is every probability that peace would have been restored long ago. The prolongation of the evils of intestine war is the consequence of the possession of Cuba. Besides this, another consequence is the frequent occasion of conflict with other states, as recent incidents prove. The Spanish fleet is at the Antilles ; therefore it cannot exercise a proper vigilance on the coasts of the provinces that are occupied by the insurgents. The insurgents fire on foreign ships passing within reach of their guns. English vessels having been struck, commerce demands resort to energetic measures, and would have England make the Spanish government answerable for these violations of international law. Spain of course can do nothing in the matter, but she is menaced both in her dignity and her interests.

It is in her relations with the United States, that Cuba especially becomes a serious stumbling-block to her. Undoubtedly aid is given to the Cuban insurgents from the neighbouring shores of the Union. The Spanish cruisers try to put a stop to this ; hence constant impediments to the regular commerce, and a good many measures that are by no means right according to the law of nations. Hence, again, energetic complaints from the American government, and from time to time threatening warnings, such as President Grant has launched more than once. The European public has just been admitted to the discussion now pending between the American and Spanish governments, and the energetic Note of the American Secretary (Nov. 5) must prove the prelude to measures more energetic still. That an American minister should not only be anxious to state the grievances of his countrymen in Cuba in such a way as to secure European sympathy, but should also directly appeal to European governments is a curious departure from the rather ostentatious isolation which American diplomacy has been wont to observe hitherto.

The United States have no interest in annexing Cuba. It would be a misfortune for the Union to take into its bosom the power of the Latin and Catholic elements, against which at this very moment the struggle is beginning in the north. But annexation would undoubtedly be in the interest of the Cubans. As a state of the Union, they would be infinitely more free ; they would govern themselves ; they would be delivered from

the shame of slavery; American capital and the American genius for enterprise would lead to a considerable development of the resources of the island; education would spread; civilisation would make rapid progress; and the wealth of the inhabitants would be immensely developed.

Moreover, it is impossible for Spain to preserve much longer her colonies in the Antilles. She will sooner or later recognise their independence; there is in this a sort of historic law. All great colonies emancipate themselves. Brazil broke away from Portugal; Peru, Chili, the States of the Plate and Central America, have all won their independence. Cuba will follow their example. If the rebellion were stifled to-day, it would break out again after a few years of rest and material prosperity. Cuba belongs too manifestly to the circle of attraction of the neighbouring continent, to remain attached to the mother-country, struggling against factions over sea. Since emancipation is unavoidable, and would be for Spain an immense relief, it is for men like Castelar, who are capable of a policy of lofty aims, and who consider the future, to dare to tell their countrymen the truth, at the risk of fretting Castilian vanity. Such an act of wisdom would be honourable to the Spanish people. It would be a thousand times more glorious for them, than any number of those wretched victories, so frequently stained as they are by cruelties, which they now and then gain over the Cuban insurgents.

M. Pelletan published a piquant writing some years ago, entitled *Qui perd gagne*, in which he showed, history in hand, that after a war it is often the vanquished that prove to be happiest. He cited among other examples, Austria, which was more free and more prosperous after she had no longer dragging at her heel the cannon-ball of Lombardo-Venetia and Italy. He might now add France, delivered by the defeats of 1870 from a corrupting system of government; richer than ever, notwithstanding the costs of the war and the indemnity; and finding in her defeats the prudence and wisdom that will enable her to govern herself, instead of rushing into the arms of a saviour. One enormous gain is that the democratic party has ceased to be a revolutionary party, and has become a governmental party. Except a not very numerous group of irreconcilables, who have neither popularity nor consistency, all the men of movement apply themselves to the defence of the established system. They are therefore the true conservatives. This favourable change, which may procure for France many years of rest and regular progress, is due in part to an institution, in part to a man. The institution is the Republic, and the man is Gambetta. The Republic no longer inspires in any one the juvenile infatuation that men used once to draw from the writers of antiquity and the classic admiration for Athens and Rome. Experience has dissipated these illusions. It has been seen that constitutional monarchy, as it is practised in England, Belgium, Holland, Italy, guarantees to nations as much liberty, and to minorities better protection, than the Republic. But in France, the memories of the French Revolution on one side, and on the other the ill success of the different dynasties that have followed one another during the present century, have attached the most active, stirring, and daring

part of the nation to the republican ideal. The monarchy throws this powerful and dangerous element into opposition. The Republic on the contrary transforms it into a force of social conservatism and defence.

France at the present moment offers a curious spectacle. The country is tranquil; it only asks for security in order to be able to work and profit by an economic situation that is really more powerful than that of any other country in Europe. It is the higher classes only and the political parties that keep up division and agitation. It is true that the general election calls everybody to the struggle. In this connection it is not inopportune to examine what influence and prestige the different parties possess. In fact, plainly only two remain in a position to dispute preponderance and the future,—the Bonapartists and the Republicans.

The Orleanist princes withdraw from political life, discouraged and isolated. The Orleanist party consequently dissolves; some incline to the Republic, following M. Lavergne; others incline to Legitimism. It is curious that this party, which counted in its ranks the greatest number of politicians of eminence, should still have always had so little influence in the country. In the rural districts it was unknown, and in the great towns it was antipathetic to the masses. It had only on its side the intelligent and sensible people, and they are in a minority all over the world. The Comte de Paris would most likely have made an excellent constitutional sovereign, like the two Leopolds in Belgium. Instructed, moderate, not in the least eager for noisy splendour or for power, preoccupied with those economic and industrial questions that are the great matters in our time, he would have presided in an admirable way over the government of the country by itself, by guiding it in the path of humanitarian reforms. But he could only come to power in succession to the Comte de Chambord, and with the support of all the clerical and monarchical forces that are now, as things stand, so profoundly divided.

Legitimism in union with clericalism, though it is destined to lose the greater part of the seats which it has held in the old chamber, will remain a powerful party, because in a Catholic country the clergy have always great forces at their disposal. But in any case we must never forget that in France the clergy does not wield the rural populations entirely at pleasure, as in the other states that are in religious subjection to Rome. Here is one of the peculiar features of the situation. The French peasant has been withdrawn from the influence of the priests, because he bought the property of the clergy and the nobles at the Revolution, and he is always afraid that the old régime would rob him of his acquisitions if it were to return. Tithes, seigniorial rights, the restitution of national property—that is what the French rustic dreads, as a peril that has never been definitively got out of the way. In many of the departments the peasants rarely go to mass, more rarely still to confession. The priest therefore has very slight hold upon them. He has not yet an idea of the means of intimidation that are employed elsewhere in confessional and pulpit. He cannot count completely even on the women. Unlike what goes on in other countries, the clergy exercise more power over the rich and comfortable classes than over the common people. Yet their

influence grows, and if they preserve the Catholic universities, they will end by making themselves masters of education in all its degrees—masters, in other words, of the future of France.

Legitimism, left to itself, has not many partisans. The country people repulse it, out of the horror in which they hold the ancient régime; much more the people of the towns, while the bourgeoisie avenge the disdain in which legitimism holds them, by a persistent enmity.

The Radical party at the present moment can only count adherents in certain great towns, Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux. The Socialist sects seem to have disappeared. Gambetta has succeeded in rallying the greater part of the 'democratic phalanx to the idea of above all things preserving the Republic. But this is a transitory situation. Radicalism and socialism have not ceased to exist. Only they have allowed themselves to be drilled and disciplined, and that is much. Bonapartism is the only force that can possibly hold the moderate republicans in check. The existence of such a party is a phenomenon almost beyond explanation. How in an intelligent country like France can there be found partisans of a system that has cost it three invasions, and which at each fall has cost it the loss of part of its territory? After so ignominious a disaster as Sedan, to think of restoring the Empire, especially to the profit of an unknown youth and a woman whose religious antipathies precipitated France into the gulf, is something not short of madness. And yet here lies the real peril.

Here is where the force of Bonapartism lies. The people have need of poetry, of a legend, of memories. To the Catholic idea, which had become weak, and to the enthusiasm of '89, which had vanished, succeeded the dazzling glory of the first Empire. The worship of the Emperor became for the French peasants a real religion, of which all the old soldiers were the missionaries. The second Empire was coincident with a great development of wealth and a great rise in prices, especially in the products of agriculture. During the reign of Napoleon III. the railways were finished, and they transported the gold of the purchaser into the remotest regions. The small cultivator, owning his plot, kept for himself all the profit, and his revenue was at least doubled. For commodities of every kind, even for wine, though its production was largely increased, the price doubled. Napoleon III. evidently had nothing at all to do with this. Nevertheless, it all went on under the Empire; it was to the Empire therefore that the peasant owed the blessed manna. This is at the root of the profound and indestructible sympathy of the rurals for Bonapartism. As the Republic represents the established order, and as for two years the harvests have been abundant and the price of cattle higher than ever, many peasants will vote for the Republic. But at bottom attachment to the Empire will subsist.

Among the enlightened classes, excepting the place-hunters and the scum of the previous régime, very few people are Bonapartists, but many are "*Bonapartisable*." The present writer asked a deputy of the defunct assembly how many of his colleagues were Bonapartist. "Fifteen or twenty," said he, "but three hundred at least are Bonapartisable." The word paints the situation. The danger for the future is that the clericals and the monarchists are nearly all of them in this category. The clergy

prefer Henry V., but the safety of the church before all things. If Henry V. is not possible, the clergy will attach themselves once more to the Empire, on condition of obtaining favour and power at its hands. In the same way the monarchists of course would far rather see the throne occupied by the representative of legitimacy, but out of hatred for the Republic they would undoubtedly help to elevate Napoleon IV., however vile the shame of such a solution. M. Buffet and the whole party of "moral order" are in this mind. When M. Buffet had the daring to say not long ago from the tribune that the Marshal would never consent to make himself the instrument of radicalism, that meant that the Marshal would never accept a Gambetta ministry. It was a Bonapartist coup d'état with which he threatened France.

According to all the probabilities, the elections will give a chamber in which moderate republicans, and monarchists inclined to rally to the republic, will predominate. The country is above all things eager for rest, and will vote for the maintenance of the existing order. But we must not think for this, that the peril of Bonapartism has disappeared. If the violence of the advanced Left were to stir any disquiet in men's minds, people would begin to suspect the future of the Republic, and instantly an irresistible current would drag the country towards the empire. When such a current once declares itself, it waxes greater as it goes. It is for the republicans to avert the danger. They will only save the Republic, even if it were once well founded, by force of prudence and wisdom. As M. Thiers said, "The Republic will be moderate or it will not be." M. Lavergne, a man whose discernment is as well known in England as it is in France, describes the situation in the following terms: "The most marked symptom, that which does most to reassure me, is a marked mitigation of feeling (*apaisement*) throughout the country. With a few exceptions, that make much stir but have little influence, one might almost say that there is hardly any political passion left. The party *cadres* and party aims subsist, but violence has disappeared. Though this is due in great part to M. Gambetta and the Left, still the deeper cause goes back to our misfortunes. It is, as we see, a new justification of the saying, *Who loses wins*. The political situation and the economic situation of France are as good as they can be. As M. Gambetta has just shown in an eloquent speech, it has only to preserve its actual institutions. Thus the republicans, even the most radical of them, are transformed into conservatives, and they thus become buttresses of order, instead of being, as they once were, agents of disorder. It would not be true to say that France finds herself very well prepared to live as a republic. That is not the case. But that is now the only form of government that can save her from the shame of an imperial restoration, and from the foreign and intestine war that would be its inevitable consequences."

Turning from the problems of other nations to our own, we are unable to forget that the first political incident of the year was the meeting of the Home Rulers at Dublin, followed by the usual negligent criticism in our



own press. One wonders how long we shall have to wait for some Irish Deak? Mr. Bright—who might perhaps even yet live to solve this dismal perplexity—has completed (January 22) the last of a trilogy of speeches which at annual intervals he has addressed to his constituents since the serious illness by which he was for a time withdrawn from political life. In these studied orations he has dealt successively with Education, Free Church, and Free Land—the three points of the Liberal programme. He has recorded his opinion of the advantages to be expected from the changes proposed, and his confidence in their ultimate adoption by the country. It may be expected that advice and suggestions coming from a statesman of Mr. Bright's experience and eminence will now receive the serious consideration and attention that have been hitherto too commonly denied to them. On the Land Question Mr. Bright's utterance is clear and simple. He repudiates all so-called fanciful solutions of the problem before him, and asks only for entire freedom of bequest, and that each generation shall be absolute owner of the soil which it occupies. To this main proposition Mr. Bright joined arguments for the extension of local self-government to the counties, as well for educational as for municipal purposes, and for the assimilation of the borough and county franchises; and he urged the Liberal party to accept this series of reforms as a sufficient incentive to united action and renewed exertions. This is advice to which the advanced Liberals cannot possibly take exception, although they may have reason to fear that in one sense it comes too late for immediate practical use. But it certainly is not open to the objections which wait on the mere official Liberal's urgency that we should suppress all definite aims, and reduce liberalism to a mere waiting for something to turn up. Nor can it be said, as of other recent proposals that a barren change of machinery is alone recommended. It is the results and objects of such a change that are brought to the front, and not the merits of the change by itself. These objects will command the support, and even the enthusiasm, of all genuine Liberals. Had the advice now tendered been offered two years ago by the Ministry to which Mr. Bright belonged, it is not impossible that the Conservative reaction might have been satiated by the return of a few brewers and distillers to the House of Commons, and might still have spared a compact Liberal majority to carry out a policy to the broad principles of which every Liberal is pledged. But for a considerable space the party has remained without a leader or a guide; it has had to grope for its own policy, and to achieve it through much tribulation. Too many sections are now pledged to Disestablishment as the next great movement, to make it quite easy to change face and to press the assault in a new direction. For one hundred persons who have already taken sides on the Church question, and formed an opinion on the kind of solution or the amount of resistance, not ten can be found who have any but the most general conceptions of the numerous and complex issues raised by the proposal for Reform of Land Tenure. And of these ten the larger number are probably already pledged to one or other of those very solutions which Mr. Bright himself repudiates. A long course of preparation and education at the hands of statesmen intimately acquainted

with the innumerable details of the subject will be necessary, before the nation can be expected to have more than a mild enthusiasm for the Land question. Meanwhile the relations of Church and State are capable of being submitted in a single question, "Shall the Church be disestablished and disendowed?" In answering this no elector will be confused by the intricacies of the problem, although it is perfectly true that the simplicity of the main issue covers many difficulties of detail that will arise at a later period. For these reasons, in addition to more personal ones, it seems unlikely that the Nonconformists and advanced Liberals, who are everywhere inclining to make ecclesiastical questions the centre of their policy and exertion, will now postpone their cause in order to combine with Whigs and Liberal Churchmen on some new object, even assuming, what is hardly probable, that the Whigs and Liberal Churchmen would march to the attack of the accepted rights of landowners with lighter hearts than they would bear to the assault on the Establishment. It is perhaps a little hard to imagine that Lord Hartington is eager to take in hand the abolition of entails, of primogeniture, and of long hereditary settlements. However, Mr. Bright has now at any rate completed a programme, and given Liberalism substance and motive. The removal of mischievous restrictions from the soil, the abolition of sectarian privilege, the diffusion of light,—these are aims worth struggling for, because they lead us forward to higher degrees of political justice and fuller national unity. Free Land, Free Church, Free Schools—the order of the procession is of little moment, provided only the procession moves.

For want of more serious topics the newspapers have given some prominence to the speeches of Sir William Harcourt, who has been warning people with political ideas and reasoned principles that they are the nuisances of public life (December 30). Well, *Dès qu'on veut accaparer les hommes, un peu de charlatanisme ne nuit pas*. But it ought not to be pushed too far. To make two lengthy political speeches without a single political idea in them, or a single point of political instruction, or a single political aspiration, save that the national government may make blunders, is surely almost an abuse of the French maxim. It only shows that the qualities which suffice to make a man a considerable figure in the present House of Commons, are not necessarily those which commend him to the respect of the country out of doors. England has been led by men of many types from Cromwell down to Lord Liverpool; neither levity nor even incapacity has prevented them from winning popularity. But England has never yet given her confidence to a politician of open and ostentatious moral vulgarity. Many hard things have been said of Mr. Disraeli within the last thirty years, but no one ever denied that he had the art of surrounding the policy of adventurism with a curious semblance of distinction. Younger men who are dazzled by that strange character and singular career should remember this. The moral flavour of Sir William Harcourt's speeches is to the flavour of Mr. Disraeli's what petroleum champagne is to Tokay. The contrast is as shocking as if one should place the delicate, the quaint, the whimsical mosaic of the Roman jeweller by the side of the staring brilliants of the Lowther Arcade. Sir William Harcourt's hectoring expos-

tulation with a few plain men who try to interest provincial people in serious politics, as distinguished from the game of battledore and shuttlecock among placemen and partisans in London, is a diverting instance of the absurd presumption which seizes even shrewd men who are once thoroughly imbued by the House of Commons tone. What is all this talk about the liberal army and loyalty and party discipline? We have taken no shilling and sworn no oath. Where there is discordancy of sentiment, what avails the circumstance of bearing the same party nickname? It is the sentiment, and not the nickname, that defines political obligation. A man's party consists of those who agree with him. The important thing for us is not to restore the last government, but to prevent party distinctions in England from becoming as meaningless as the distinctions between Democrat and Republican have been more than once in the United States, to the egregious deterioration of all public life in that country whenever it has happened. The battle is for causes, not for persons; for elevation of the national life, not for promoting the claims of individuals to office. However, the Lowther Arcade is a cheerful and prosperous spot in its way, and no most advanced liberal cherishes any resentment against Sir W. Harcourt. He has been an advanced liberal himself before now, and we are all quite sure that he will be so again, as soon as political opinion in the country has been effectively stirred by those whom he now rather gracelessly denounces as the nuisances of public life.

The speeches by which Mr. Holms has endeavoured to excite public interest about the army are of a much more respectable stamp than these "lean and flashy songs" about the Liberal party. Mr. Holms has taken up a substantial and important question; he has adopted certain views upon it; and he follows the proper and wholesome course of trying to bring the constituencies to agree with him. The condition of the army is of high importance, whether we happen to be adherents of non-intervention, or dissidents from it. For if we are bent on never intervening, the military instrument is much too costly; and if we are in any risk of intervening, it is much too weak. It is true that there are a good many points in the organization of the army, about which it is hard for anybody but experts to form a solid opinion. And the experts have been allowed to have their own way, with a result that must be at least as unsatisfactory to themselves as it is to other people. The nation has an odd and not very intelligible feeling about soldiers. It has no such pride in them as it has in its sailors. There is a very unjust tendency to look upon the Line as the resort of the noodles of the upper classes and the scapegraces of the lower. The arrival of militia regiments for their periods of training is abhorred by the towns where they are quartered. All the associations of national pride seem to have centred round one of the two great services, and there is no keen and vigorous interest in the other. This is the only explanation of the fact that the government of the army is allowed to remain a sort of special craft and mystery, about which the constituencies are absolutely ignorant and indifferent. Criticism has damaged some of Mr. Holms's figures, but the War Office ought to be as grateful as any one else to any member of parliament who endeavours to make the subject one of genuine popular interest. Whatever may be the

case with the Duke of Cambridge and the small professional clique, a statesman like Mr. Hardy can have no wish to veil the actual facts about the army, what our forces are, what they ought to be, and how they are to be made what they ought to be. It may be very well to march valorously into the great European camp with one hundred and seventy-six thousand sharers in a French canal company, by way of buckler and sword. But if our army, which must always be a comparatively small one, is not only ostensibly small, but even smaller and more of a skeleton than it looks, we shall one day pay for our temerity and virtuous disinterestedness by faring extremely ill in the great European camp. The prevailing inclination to take more of a part in continental concerns, going along with the prevailing disinclination to accept the obligation of personal military service in any shape, marks a really perilous state of things. It is folly to talk of alliances, interventions, backing of representations, unless you are prepared to pay the price; yet the louder this talk becomes, the harder is it to find recruits for Militia and Line. Your foreign policy, we were told not many years ago on high authority, must govern your armaments. It would be a wholesome rule that nobody should be allowed to ask us to lift a finger in Europe, unless he is prepared to remedy the present dead failure of voluntary enlistment. To take another point of view. If it be true that our armed force is absolutely inadequate to resist 100,000 invaders of the best continental stamp, then our independence is in the last resort at the mercy of any great brigand who may again arise in Europe. Again, if things are not so bad as this, it is still true that our military instrument is enormously costly, and tends to become more so in proportion as the wages of pacific industry rise; that we shall get a constantly deteriorating class of recruits; and that we maintain a host of the community, prevented from marriage, devoid for the most part of industrial skill, and cut off from civil life. The maintenance of a force which is at once inefficient for its purpose, prodigiously expensive, and a demoralised element of social life, can scarcely be a permanent article of national policy. And such a force cannot be maintained. The figures are deplorable, and so are the men. But compulsion, we are told, is not to be dreamt of. The nation will never endure it. And just in the same way only three or four years ago we used to be told that the nation would never endure compulsion in the education of their children. Yet we see that the nation does endure it, and endures it cheerfully, and seeks its extension. The truth is that Englishmen are less foolish than timorous politicians think. They will bear whatever they have been persuaded is necessary and wholesome for the national good. Why will people not speak with some manliness in this matter? A conscription of German, or even of French, severity could no doubt only be borne in an extreme crisis of English destiny. This is not now possible, and it is not necessary. But there is a growing necessity—and perhaps not less a moral than a military necessity—to accept the principle of personal liability and obligation to serve in the militia, and in a militia of a much more effective and strenuous sort than our present system produces. Care would have to be taken that no shadow of privilege or exemption, within the limits of age, should attach to high rank or a long purse. That done, if the young mechanic had to bear the same burden as the young lawyer or young peer,

and if the case were fairly and frankly laid before the people, what reason is there to suppose that Englishmen would be less willing to do their duty in this than in other respects? There is nothing in the principle of a National as distinguished from a hired Standing army, with which a Liberal need quarrel, while there is much in the way of morality and discipline and patriotism which he may very eagerly embrace. One of the soundest Liberals that ever lived, wrote in 1871: "Militarism in some form we must have; and it seems to me, our wisdom will lie, not in holding up our hands and screaming against the inevitable, but in endeavouring to minimise, as far as may be, the necessary evil, and in extracting from it, while it lasts, whatever accidental element of good it may contain. This is what the scheme of national armies does accomplish. . . . The popular principle by diffusing attenuates the evil, and making every man potentially a soldier, places the liberties of the country on the only sure foundation, the ability of all in the last resort to defend them." (J. E. Cairnes: *Political Essays*, 247.)

Compulsory training for home service will not help us over the difficulty of manning the regular army, with the drafts for India. The necessity of a garrison in India is probably one of the worst of the many drawbacks of the most tremendous task which *μολρα κραταιή* ever imposed on a people. Indian service is at once one of the main causes of the weakness of our home battalions, and of the reluctance of our people to enlist. However, India has to be faced, just as an armed and restless Europe has to be faced. Only it is time to come out of the fool's paradise in which as to military affairs we have been longer content to remain, than is consistent with national self-respect.

The chief object of popular interest has been the Fugitive Slave Circular. Whether the instructions recently issued by the Admiralty to the captains of the Navy are in accordance with the best traditions of English policy may be brought to a simple test. In admitting fugitive slaves on board English ships on the high seas, the Admiralty is hampered by no international obligations. On the high seas, an English ship knows no law but the law of England. On the high seas we are free to indulge our hatred of slavery, "the sum of all villainies," and even if our prejudice in favour of freedom were less respectable than it is, we have a right to enjoy the luxury without exposing ourselves to any legitimate ground of complaint. The effect of admitting a slave on board an English ship of war on the high seas is the same as allowing him to touch the soil of England,—he immediately becomes free. This was settled in the case of *Forbes v. Cochrane* in 1824. An English captain, therefore, in admitting a fugitive slave on board his ship confers on him the boon of liberty. By what principle should a captain be guided in exercising this privilege? Should he, in favour of freedom, admit fugitive slaves so far as consistent with the discipline and convenience of his vessel? Or should he out of tenderness to the interests of his master refuse an asylum to the slave? The answer given by the Second Circular is as follows:—"When any person professing or appearing to be a fugitive slave, seeks admission to your ship on the high sea, beyond the limit of territorial waters, and claims the protection

of the British flag, you will bear in mind that her Majesty's ships are not intended for the reception of persons other than their officers and crew. You will satisfy yourself, therefore, before receiving him on board, that there is some sufficient ground in the particular case for thus receiving him." It is worthy of remark that this instruction lays down no clear or intelligible rule ; it does not say when a fugitive slave should be admitted and when he should not ; but it throws on the captain the burden of showing cause why he should in the particular case admit the slave. What is the meaning of this churlish and inhospitable order ? That may be learned from Circular No. 1. That circular affirmed as " a broad rule," that " a fugitive slave should not be permanently received on board any description of ship under the British flag, unless his life would be endangered if he were not allowed to come on board." The reason for this rule is then stated. " A contrary rule would lead to endless disputes and difficulties with the legal masters of slaves ; for it might happen, to take an extreme instance, that the whole slave portion of the crews of vessels engaged in the pearl fishery in the Persian Gulf might take refuge on board British ships, and, if free there, their masters would be entirely ruined, and the mistrust and hatred caused in their minds would be greatly prejudicial to British interests."

The chain of reasoning that has led the Government to abandon the traditions of English policy is thus apparent. If a slave gets on board an English vessel he will be free ; if he is free, his master will be deprived of his services ; if his master is deprived of his services, he will be angry with us ; if the master is angry with us, it will be prejudicial to our interests. The conclusion is inevitable. The door is to be shut in the face of the slave *because* it is the gateway of freedom. To this pusillanimous conclusion, through the steps of an ignoble sorites, are we led by " the spirited foreign policy " of the Government.

It is to be hoped that the Government will not be allowed to ride off from the plain issue raised in the first part of the circular, under cover of the questions of international law contained in the second part. In the reception of fugitive slaves on the high sea, unfettered by any international obligations, the Admiralty instructs its subordinates that they are to use the privilege of hospitality not for, but against the slave ; not against, but for the master. A fugitive slave on board a ship on the high seas is to be a *rara avis* ; but when the ship is in a port of a slaveholding State, or anywhere within three miles of its shores, the exclusion of slaves is to be peremptory and absolute. " If while your ship is within the territorial waters of a State where slavery exists, a person professing to be a fugitive slave seeks admission into your ship, you will not admit him unless his life would be in manifest danger if he were not received on board. Should you, in order to save him from this danger, receive him, you ought not, after the danger is past, to permit him to continue on board."

It will be difficult to reconcile the country to this harsh and unbending rule, unless it be conclusively shown that the requirements of international law leave the Government no alternative. If a captain, without violating the law of nations, can give shelter to a slave, and he voluntarily sends the man back to slavery, he is made an accomplice in the crime of robbing him of his

liberty, which English judges tell us is originally the gift of nature. If, moreover, it appears that in order to find an excuse for refusing shelter to slaves, the circular introduces a new rule of international law, and tampers with our rights, the Government will deserve and obtain the severest condemnation.

All authorities agree that a ship of war within the territorial waters of a foreign State continues to "remain a part of the territory of her sovereign." Mr. Justice Phillimore states the rule thus:—"Long usage and universal custom entitle every such ship [of war] to be considered as a part of the State to which she belongs, and to be exempt from any other jurisdiction." Nevertheless, the Second Circular, undeterred by the evil fate of the First, proceeds, with magnificent nonchalance, to cut down the right of extra-territoriality. The Government, on their own responsibility, introduce a restriction that appears to be unknown to the best writers and the recognised authorities on international law. The exception is thus expressed:—"You are bound by the comity of nations not to allow her [your vessel] to become a shelter for those who would be chargeable with a violation of the law of the place."

Of all countries in the world England has the strongest interest in maintaining the extra-territoriality of her ships of war. If it be necessary to limit the right, considering the importance of the interests at stake, we ought to proceed with the greatest caution, and avoid committing ourselves to vague rules that may in future give rise to the most embarrassing controversies. Now every word of the new limitation seems to have been introduced for the express purpose of giving occasion to dispute. The phrase "comity of nations" may mean either "that kindness which emanates from a friendly feeling," or something "*due* between nations on the ground of right." In which sense the phrase is to be understood the circular does not inform us. But in whichever sense it be understood, it will place the Government in an awkward position. If the admission of persons chargeable with violating the law of the place would give "a just cause of complaint," we are landed in this difficulty. Would not the State having such a just cause of complaint be entitled to prevent by force a vessel that had incriminated persons on board from leaving her territorial waters? The right to depart unmolested is conditional upon the friendly conduct of the ship of war. If then she violates a law imposed by the comity of nations, is not the right forfeited? Are we then prepared to submit to the arrest and detention of a vessel of war on the ground that she has persons on board "who would be chargeable with a violation of the law of the place"? These are some of the consequences we must face if we admit that the exclusion of obnoxious persons is *due* as a matter of right. If then we take the other alternative, and affirm that their exclusion is to be done from "that kindness which emanates from friendly feeling," the Government is impaled on the other horn of a dilemma. Surely if the exclusion of slaves from our ships is not due by strict law, but only by courtesy, the people of England may claim that our kindness shall be shown to the victim, not to his oppressor,—to the slave that is robbed of his rights, not to the man that robs him.

Jan. 27, 1876.

# THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

NO. CXI. NEW SERIES.—MARCH 1, 1876.

## THE DISESTABLISHMENT MOVEMENT.

WE have been reminded lately, with considerable emphasis, that the question of the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the English Church is “eminently a practical one,” and that “it cannot be dealt with according to abstract theories.” Thirty years ago, when the Disestablishment movement began, there was apparent ground for the suggestion that its leaders did not discriminate between the province of political speculation and the province of practical politics.

The movement had its origin in deep religious convictions—I might almost say, in fervent religious enthusiasm. Mr. Edward Miall and the men who were associated with him in founding what is now known as the Liberation Society, objected to the ecclesiastical Establishment because they believed that it was altogether out of harmony with the genius of the Christian faith. To them it seemed that the Establishment had succeeded in secularising the Church, and that it had failed in Christianising the State. They argued that the zeal of the laity is repressed when the maintenance of the institutions of worship is provided for by national endowments; that the system of patronage, which they contended is an essential part of the Establishment, must exert a pernicious influence on the spirit and on the efficiency of the clergy; and that when the creed and ritual of a Church are fixed by act of parliament, the Church suffers a loss of spiritual freedom, for which the alleged advantages it receives from the State can constitute no adequate compensation. All these arguments were illustrated and enforced by an appeal to notorious and glaring ecclesiastical abuses, nearly all of which have disappeared, and which to the present generation are almost incredible.

The movement was religious in its origin, and for many years nearly all who took a prominent part in it were actuated by religious motives. But as no practical results were possible apart from politi-



cal action, it was necessary to justify the movement on political grounds. The leaders found an extremely convenient political theory ready to their hand. They were Radicals, and many of the Radicals of those days believed that when the State attempts anything more than the direct defence of life and property against "force and fraud," it passes beyond the limits within which its action should be confined. On that theory the State exceeds its true powers when it builds lighthouses on the dangerous points of our coast; when it makes an ordnance survey, and publishes ordnance maps; when it sends an expedition to the North Pole; when it establishes a post-office, and buys up the telegraph lines; votes money to the London University and to the British Museum; and above all, when it levies rates and makes grants from the Consolidated Fund for the erection and maintenance of elementary schools. The theory reduces the State to a machine for building prisons and courts of law; for organizing the police, selecting jurymen, and paying the salaries of judges.

This ignoble and impracticable limitation of the functions of the State has been long abandoned. As a party—there are individual exceptions—the Radicals have been gradually drifting to a theory which is the precise antithesis of the creed held by many Radicals thirty years ago. The change in their position has excited the surprise and even the anxiety of liberal politicians on the Continent who are acquainted with English politics. During the first quarter of this century, it was the Tory party which was always calling for the interference of the State in the affairs of the people, and the theory of a paternal government was the perpetual object of Radical invective and derision. Now it is the advanced wing of the Radical party which insists that in a thousand directions the State has been guilty of a flagrant neglect of duty, and that the wealth and intelligence, and the general prosperity of the country imperatively demand new legislation. This extraordinary revulsion of opinion admits of a very simple and obvious explanation; but at first sight the history of the Radical party during the last half century in relation to the true limits of legislative action is as grotesque as the story of the apparent inconsistencies of William von Humboldt. In 1792 he wrote an essay—fortunately he did not publish it—in which he contended that both education and the maintenance of religion lie altogether beyond the true province of civil government; in 1809 he was a Prussian minister of state, and had charge of the department of religious worship and public instruction.

It was a mere accident, however, that the early Liberationists identified their movement with the narrowest, meanest, and most impracticable political theory that any rational intellect ever invented. When the theory disappeared, one of the stock arguments

was no longer heard from Liberation platforms, but the forces which gave real strength to the movement continued to act with undiminished vigour. No element of power had been lost.

There are no doubt many Liberationists who still hold a "theory" about the functions of civil government in relation to religion. But the theory is negative rather than positive. They contend that the State is necessarily disqualified by the nature of its organization for interfering advantageously with religious faith and worship, and that the characteristic life and glory of modern civilisation consist in the gradual rescue of the whole domain of religion from the control of the civil government. The general principle assumes a more definite form when it is stated by those Liberationists who have a strong faith in the supernatural claims of the Christian revelation. To "establish" a false religion must be pernicious; and for a Christian government to endeavour to suppress a false religion by public law is to violate the fundamental principles of the Christian faith. To persecute Christianity is a crime; to endeavour to sustain it by any other means than the spontaneous service and free gifts of those who believe in it, is contrary to its essential spirit; and to place the control of the Church and the administration of its affairs in the hands of secular rulers is certain to lessen its spiritual power and to render ecclesiastical and doctrinal corruption inevitable. The State may resist religious organizations when they imperil social order and tranquillity; it may punish priests when, in the name of religion, they inflict any injury on the person, or property, or reputation of individual citizens; it may restrain acts which are immoral and of evil example, even when those acts are defended by an appeal to religious sanctions; it may repress public religious celebrations which disturb the public peace; in other words, when religion encroaches on the province of the State, the State has the right, and is under the obligation, to assert its own authority, and to protect the general interests of the nation; but religion, as such, should neither be assisted nor persecuted by civil governments.

Those Nonconformists who are most active and prominent in the Liberation movement, hold some such theory as this. But the theory is no essential part of the case of the Liberationists. A man may be a zealous Liberationist, and yet believe that when Augustine came to England it was natural and expedient that the Saxon kings who received the new faith should enforce the payment of tithes, and give to bishops and mitred abbots seats in the national councils. He may glory in the policy of Elizabeth and her statesmen in relation to Rome, and may only regret that the policy was not more consistent, more vigorous, and more thorough. But the question has become one of practical politics, and passed to the "positive stage."

This transition has been greatly assisted by a clearer apprehension during the last few years of the true nature of the ecclesiastical Establishment in this country. Till recently the popular conception of it corresponded very closely with that of Bishop Warburton. The State and the Church were regarded as two great independent powers which had entered into an alliance for their mutual advantage—the State conferring authority, dignity, and wealth, the Church, in return, surrendering a large measure of her independence, and engaging to promote the cause of order and morality among the people. Neither the Liberationists nor their opponents have quite given up this way of stating the case. Conservative newspapers still describe the Church as a great corporation possessing vast wealth, which the State is bound to respect just as it respects the wealth of great landed proprietors. Liberation speakers still denounce the injustice of which the State is guilty in selecting one Church out of many, and conferring on its ministers exceptional privileges, and endowing them with national property. The Liberation attack is no doubt fairly justified by what Mr. Freeman describes as “the actual state of English law as to ecclesiastical matters.”<sup>1</sup> The Conservative idea of a great corporation is a delusion altogether. There is no such corporation as the Church of England known to English law. Nor, on the one hand, was there ever any formal contract between the State and the Church, nor any deliberation on the part of the State as to which of several Churches it should endow. Nor is there, properly speaking, an “alliance” between the Church and the State in England any more than there is an alliance between the army and the State, or between the State and the Civil Service. “An alliance between Church and State in a Christian commonwealth,” said Edmund Burke, “is, in my opinion, an idle and fanciful speculation. An alliance is between two things that are in their nature distinct and independent, such as between two Sovereign States. But in a Christian commonwealth the Church and the State are one and the same thing, being different parts of the same whole.” Richard Hooker held the same ground. He said in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, “There is not any man of the Church of England but the same is also a member of the commonwealth, nor any member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England.” This is what Dean Stanley means when he describes Methodists, Independents, and Baptists as “nonconforming members of the Church of England.”

Mr. Freeman has put the case very clearly:—“In early times the Church was simply the nation, looked at with reference to religion, just as the army was the nation looked at with reference to warfare. The nation in its civil, its ecclesiastical, and its military character

(1) See the whole passage, “Disestablishment and Disendowment.” By Edward A. Freeman, pp. 26—30.

might have three sets of leaders."<sup>1</sup> "The whole thing, in short, like everything else in this country, came of itself. The Church Establishment has just the same history as the House of Commons or as trial by jury. It is the creation of the law; but it is not the creation of any particular law, but of the general course of our law, written and unwritten."<sup>2</sup> "The ministers of the Church were national officers for one set of purposes, enjoying the rights and privileges and subject to the responsibilities of national officers."<sup>3</sup> "This is beyond doubt the original meaning of the Church being 'by law established.' It does not mean, as the word is used now, an 'Established Church,' as opposed to some other religious body which is not 'established.' This is a sense which grew up later. The Church was 'established,' as any other of the institutions of the country was established. It was 'established' just as government by King, Lords, and Commons was 'established.' It no more came into any man's head that there could be another Church, Popish or Puritan, alongside of the Anglican Church established by law, than that there could be another government, despotic or republican, alongside of the limited monarchy established by law."<sup>4</sup>

The institution was the natural growth of ages, when religious divisions were unknown in England, or when they were vigorously repressed. In those days the parishioners in every parish in the country were baptized at the same font, said the same creed, confessed to the same priest, were married with the same rites, worshipped before the same altar. Apart from any "theory" about the limits of the true province of civil government, it was just as reasonable that the priesthood should be a national institution as the magistracy, just as reasonable that the Archbishop of Canterbury should have a seat in the House of Lords as the Lord Chancellor. There is no occasion for Liberationists to contend that in those times the national organization for religious purposes was either unjust or injurious. They may even admit that it assisted to civilise the nation and to consolidate national unity; that the position which it gave to the clergy was friendly to the diffusion of education and encouraged the more peaceful virtues, that the honours and authority which it conferred upon bishops were a wholesome restraint on the power of rough and ignorant and turbulent barons.

But the whole condition of the nation has undergone a great and vital change. At the present moment half the population appear to have given up attendance at public worship altogether. Of the remaining half, the national Church can claim only a doubtful majority. The number of those who, even on the occasion of marriage, accept the office of the national clergy is steadily de-

(1) "Disestablishment and Disendowment," p. 41.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 42..

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 44.

(4) *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 48.

clining.<sup>1</sup> And yet the national Church remains. Its bishops are still nominated by the Crown and sit in the House of Lords. Ecclesiastical law is still a special branch of the legal profession, and is administered by special judges. There is still a clergyman of the national Church in every parish in the kingdom. In hundreds of cases he is appointed by the Lord Chancellor or by the Crown. He alone has the right to conduct worship in the parish church, and to utter words of sorrow and hope and consolation over the dead that are buried in the parish graveyard. He still retains that civil right to tithe the produce of the land, which was originally conceded to the priests a thousand years ago, when all who owned the land and all who cultivated it claimed their services. Estates which were given by private benefactors or were reserved under enclosure acts, for the maintenance of the clergy when men were burnt or imprisoned, or exiled for disbelieving their teaching or neglecting their worship, are still appropriated to their support. We have, therefore, the extraordinary anomaly of a national institution for providing religious worship in which one half of the nation refuse to join, and which is so unsatisfactory to half of the remaining half that they prefer to provide forms of worship of their own. The

(1) About 75 per cent. of the population are still married at church. For the Church to claim three-fourths of the nation as churchmen because they go to church to be married is, however, most preposterous. In most parts of the country it is much more convenient to be married at church than to be married at a Nonconformist chapel. The clergyman unites in himself the office of minister of religion and registrar, so that the bridegroom and his friends have to obtain the presence of only one man if the marriage is at church. The services of two men have to be obtained at a Nonconformist marriage. The registration "districts" are also extremely confusing, and sometimes occasion grave inconvenience. People who have no religion at all get married at church as a matter of course, just as nearly all the burglars and wife-beaters committed to gaol register themselves as "churchmen." Since, notwithstanding the special inconvenience attaching to dissenting weddings, and the sentimental attractions to which even Dissenters are not insensible, of a service celebrated in an ancient and beautiful building, a fourth of the population are married either at chapel or at the registrar's office—where, by the way, many Dissenters prefer to have their marriages legally performed—it is probable that the returns of the religious census of 1851 may still be trusted. These showed, speaking broadly, that half the population were absent from worship on census Sunday; and that those who were present were about equally divided between the Establishment and the sects; in other words, that the sects had secured about a fourth of the population. For the Church to claim the adherence of almost three-fourths of the nation, on the ground that about three-fourths of the children educated in public elementary schools are educated in Church of England schools, would be—well, I will simply call it audacious. It is obvious that throughout the rural districts, it is rarely practicable, and still more rarely desirable, to have more than one school within the reach of most of the population. If there can be only one school, and if that school is a denominational school, the school is necessarily the school of the clergyman. Under our present educational system vast numbers of Nonconformists are practically compelled to send their children to Church of England schools: to point to their presence there as a proof that their parents are Churchmen, would be to presume a little too much on the ignorance of the country. And since the Establishment has three-fourths of the children at school, how is it that it has secured the attendance of only a fourth of the population at church?

country is covered with religious teachers commissioned by the State and under its control, to whose teaching one half of the nation refuse to listen, while half of the remaining half meet every week to listen to men who by their very separation from the national Establishment imply that in their judgment much of its teaching is false, or that its discipline or ritual merits strong condemnation. What they all imply by their separation, many of them very distinctly express, maintaining that the doctrine of the national Church is not the doctrine of Christ and of his apostles, that its polity is out of harmony with the principles and spirit of the Christian faith, and that some of its offices are tainted with the old superstitions which for centuries impaired the strength and obscured the glory of the religious life of all Christendom.

Nor can a statesman disregard the bitter and vehement conflicts by which the adherents of the national Church are themselves distracted. It seems probable that not more than a fourth of the population regularly attend the services conducted by the national clergy, and of this number a very considerable proportion are incessantly protesting against the manner in which the services are conducted, and denouncing the teaching of their authorised religious instructors. All the boundless resources of theological abuse are employed in the internecine conflict. Evangelical denounces Ritualist, Ritualist denounces Evangelical, and they both unite to denounce the Broad Churchman; while the Nonconformists protest against all these, though with better temper and greater moderation than they show to each other. Take any one type of the religious teaching provided by the national Establishment, and it will probably be condemned by a majority of the clergy. The majority of the lay adherents of the Church of England still sympathize, I believe, with evangelical doctrine; but several years ago it was acknowledged that the evangelical party could hardly claim more than a fourth of the whole number of the clergy.

Imagine any other national establishment regarded with indifference, distrust, or hostility by three-fourths of the nation! Imagine any other national establishment about the administration of which the remaining fourth were so seriously divided! A statesman would at once conclude that searching reform or immediate abolition was imperative.

Any movement for the reform of the Establishment, undertaken with a hope of restoring its national character, would be the most quixotic of enterprises. No one having any acquaintance with the principles and spirit of the various sections of Nonconformity would ever dream that such a scheme could be successful. Amiable and scholarly clergymen—familiar with the ecclesiastical struggles of two centuries ago, and not altogether ignorant of the Nonconformist lite-

ture of the first half of the last century, and having perhaps some personal acquaintance with a few elderly Nonconformist laymen or ministers, men of excellent character, and perhaps of large accomplishments, but whose fighting days are over, and who sigh for rest and peace—sometimes talk hopefully about comprehension. But their proposals come too late. A few Nonconformists might be disposed to consider and to accept a scheme of reconciliation, if the scheme were of a kind which it would be impossible for a statesman to submit to the House of Commons, and which would make Churchmen more furious than any scheme for disestablishment and disendowment; but no scheme, possible or impossible, would have any appreciable effect in diminishing the strength of the great Nonconformist denominations. Make the Church comprehensive enough to admit those who explicitly deny Trinitarianism, and a few Unitarians might come in; but I doubt whether half a dozen Unitarian churches in the country would be closed, or half a dozen Unitarian congregations broken up. Remove from the services of the Church all traces of Sacramentalism, and a few eccentric Independents might conform; but the meetings of the Congregational Union would be just as large and just as active as ever; there would be no arrest of chapel-building; the men who had gone over would not be missed. Offer to receive the Wesleyan Methodists bodily into the Church; permit them to revise the Prayer-Book and its offices; let them preserve all their present organizations and customs,—their class-meetings, their love-feasts, and their circuits; give them sure guarantees that their people would never have to listen to ritualistic preaching, and that their ministers would never have to hear a charge from the learned and kindly, but rather pedantic, Bishop of Lincoln; and then, perhaps, a few score of ministers over forty years of age, and a few dozen wealthy laymen, and a few farmers who find that landlords will not let farms to Wesleyan tenants, might desert the ranks; but the circuits of the ministers and the vacant offices of the laymen would be filled up in a year or two; Wesleyanism would remain as vigorous as before, and its hostility to the political Establishment would be incalculably intensified. Before Tractarianism began to be strong, when Evangelicalism was the supreme power in the Church, a bold, sagacious, and powerful ecclesiastic might, perhaps, have offered terms to Wesleyan Methodists which a considerable proportion of them would have been ready to accept. But the same law of development that has been illustrated in the other Nonconformist communities has been illustrated in the Methodists. They left the Established Church because they were obliged to leave it. Having studied the Establishment under the aspects which it presents to those outside, nothing would induce them to return.

It should be remembered that the Nonconformists have painfully and laboriously built up their separate organizations. They, too, have their traditions. They have their saints and their martyrs. Affection, loyalty, and veneration bind them to the faith and to the polity for which many of them have worked hard, for which some of them have suffered much, and which are associated in the hearts of all with the memories they most care to cherish, both of the living and of the dead.

Comprehension is hopeless. Mr. Brodrick, in the last number of this Review, suggests that perhaps "the wisest Nonconformists" may be "prepared to accept such an ecclesiastical settlement as would bring Church affairs and the disposition of national Church property within the sphere and under the effectual control of local government."<sup>1</sup> I find it difficult to imagine any settlement of this kind that could be proposed to Parliament by a responsible minister. Ecclesiastical struggles, when conducted on a national scale, are sufficiently bitter; parochial and municipal struggles for the control of Church doctrine and discipline would be an intolerable scandal. Is the parish to determine the question whether, on the one hand, the Unitarians are still to be condemned to eternal perdition every Christmas morning, or whether, on the other hand, my friend, Mr. Crosskey, is to be appointed to the rectory with the power of modifying the service as he pleases? Are the rate-payers to have their choice between a priest bringing testimonials from Cardinal Manning and a presbyter strongly recommended by Dr. Cumming? How often might a decision, once reached, be revised? Is there to be a possibility of getting both service and rector changed every November when Town Councillors are elected? Or should the term of office be for three years? Or should it be for life?

Perhaps it might be recommended that the various sects, as far as they can be accommodated, should have the free use of the parish church on Sunday in turn—the Episcopalians in the morning, the Independents in the afternoon, and the Methodists in the evening; and that the tithes and the rent of the glebe should be fairly distributed between them in the ratio of the number of persons attending the several services. But what a terrible outcry there would be in that case from Baptists, Plymouth Brethren, Bible Christians, Primitive Methodists, Unitarians, and all the other religious communities that would be left out in the cold! The larger Nonconformist sects have for the most part no controversies with each other now; the ministers are constantly exchanging pulpits, the congregations of one sect show a friendly and fraternal interest in their neighbours by going to their tea-meetings on week-days, and to their anniversary services on Sundays. But if they ever so lost their heads as to consent

(1) *Fortnightly Review*, February, 1876, p. 193.



to an ecclesiastical settlement, which would make them rivals for a share in the ecclesiastical property in every parish in the kingdom, quiet men who care for peace and Christian charity would have to give up church and chapel-going altogether.

There may no doubt be some districts in which such a scheme could be carried out for a time, without any grave practical difficulty. Where parishes have landlords who are careful to weed out Nonconformist farmers by refusing to accept Nonconformist tenants, and where the vicars are like the Vicar of Woolavington, who thinks it his duty to prevent a Nonconformist schoolmistress from being employed by the School Board lest she should introduce into his ecclesiastical preserve, "a probable cause of strife in the shape of schism in petticoats,"<sup>1</sup> some sort of agreement might be arrived at which, perhaps, would work smoothly, until the land happened to come into the hands of a proprietor whose sense of justice was unfortunately more active than his religious bigotry, and the living into the hands of a vicar whose zeal for charity was unhappily stronger than his ecclesiastical antipathies. But there are thousands of parishes in which dissent has made sure its ground, and from which neither landlord nor vicar can expel it. In every one of these, any scheme for remitting ecclesiastical affairs to local control would kindle a conflagration compared with which the old conflict about church rates was mere child's play. What would be the effect of such a scheme in Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Birmingham, and Bradford, let any one imagine, who has learnt from history or knows from experience the possible violence of religious enthusiasm when religious sects forget the true method of diffusing religious faith and strive for political supremacy. Mr. Brodrick's scheme—if I have any understanding of its principles—would receive from Nonconformists, and, I venture to think, from "the wisest Nonconformists," opposition as resolute as it would receive from churchmen.

Comprehension is hopeless. The doors of the Church may be opened as wide as you please—the doors may be taken down altogether—but the Nonconformists will not go in. It is not my present business to justify their refusal. I have simply to state the facts of the case. It must be assumed in this discussion, that whatever the legislature may attempt in the way of re-organizing the Church of England, the religious communities which are outside the Establishment, will remain outside.

Further, the example of Scotland should be sufficient to warn ecclesiastical reformers of the probable effect of any change intended to make the Anglican Establishment more acceptable to Nonconformists.

The obstacles to "comprehension" in Scotland are far less serious than in England. Between the Free Church—the strongest of the

(1) See the Vicar's letter, *Times*, February 5, 1876.

voluntary communities—and the Establishment, the distinctions are hardly appreciable by most southerners. The members of the two Churches accept the same Calvinistic Confession of Faith, and the same Presbyterian polity. Their form of worship is the same. Their mode of administering the Sacraments is the same. Free Churchmen do not deny that the civil magistrate may lawfully render direct aid to the Church of Christ; they have never renounced the theory of a national ecclesiastical Establishment. It was supposed that the Patronage Bill passed two years ago, transferring the appointment to livings from the crown, from town councils, and from private patrons, to the communicants of the Scotch Church, would open the way for a reconciliation. The old law of patronage was the principal ground on which the Free Churchmen seceded; its repeal seemed the first step towards their re-absorption.

But the Free Church strongly objects to being re-absorbed. Speaking at Jedburgh a few weeks ago, Dr. Rainy, the most powerful, perhaps, of the Free Church leaders, was referring to those friends of the Establishment who said to the Free Churchmen, "You may all come back to us now, we see nothing to hinder you," and a voice in the meeting cried, "Hear." "Ah, very well," said Dr. Rainy, "then my reply is, we are the judges, and not you, as to whether there is anything to hinder us. We have judged very plainly and emphatically. You may think our decision unreasonable; you have a perfect right to think so. But you must take it to be a fact. And you must remember that when an Establishment ceases to command the adherence of large masses of the people, the change in its position is simply a fact to be accepted. The opinion which you entertain that the separation is unreasonable, can do just nothing at all to alter the facts, nor to alter the conclusions to be deduced from them." This is not very encouraging to the authors of schemes for comprehension. In Scotland the first proposal of that sort is firmly declined by the very Church which ecclesiastical politicians might naturally have supposed would listen to their plans with the greatest favour. Nor is this all. The Free Church leaders, instead of being attracted and soothed, are provoked. They regard the policy of comprehension as an insidious attempt to dissolve and to break up their own Church. The Patronage Bill has made them Liberationists. The first attempt at "comprehension" in Scotland is answered by a movement for Disestablishment and Disendowment. In England similar attempts would provoke similar irritation and resentment among the English Nonconformists, and the present antagonism to the Establishment, instead of being alleviated, would be intensified.

What was once the Church of the nation has now practically become the Church of a sect—of a sect which, if we are to reckon only those who regularly attend its services, does not include, in all

probability, more than a fourth of the population. There is no chance of making it anything else than the Church of a sect. The Liberationists maintain that the time for disestablishing it has fully come. Some of the political and general grounds on which we urge this policy, I propose to state as briefly as I can.

We think it a monstrous injustice that a great national institution should be maintained for the advantage of a mere section of the community; we think that the injustice is not diminished by the fact that the persons who receive the benefits conferred by this institution are eminently respectable on account of their rank, their political influence, their wealth, their learning, the excellence of their personal character, and the sincerity and earnestness of their piety. To demonstrate the injustice, it seems hardly necessary to do more than state the facts which illustrate the failure of the Establishment to retain more than a fourth of the people in its communion. To describe its clergy as the national clergy is a courteous but transparent fiction. There is something entertaining in the seriousness with which the clergy assume that the fiction rests on a solid basis of fact. The Bishop of Peterborough appears to have been challenged lately by some gentleman on the manner in which he exercised his episcopal patronage. The Bishop replied that he did not administer his patronage "upon any 'system,' if by that word is understood any fixed routine or order of procedure, as, for instance, that of seniority." In the Bishop's opinion—and he states it with edifying gravity—"the patron is simply a trustee for the spiritual interests of the *parishioners*." "The right of the *parishioners* to the best and fittest pastor that I can find for them is the only vested interest or right that I can recognise in the case."<sup>1</sup> How droll it must all sound to the Nonconformists in the various parishes of his lordship's diocese! His lordship is a trustee for their spiritual interests. They have a right to the best and fittest pastor he can find for them, and that is the only vested interest or right that he can recognise. And when the best or fittest pastor comes, the services and collections in "Bethesda" and "Mount Zion" and "Ebenezer" have to go on just the same as before; and the best and fittest pastor receives eight hundred or a thousand a year for taking charge of the spiritual interests of parishioners, half or two-thirds of whom never pass through the porch of his church. It is the same fiction which dominates the imagination of the clergymen whose speeches I occasionally read in the newspapers, and who make earnest appeals to the public for sympathy and sometimes for help, on the ground that they have charge of twelve thousand, sixteen thousand, and twenty thousand souls. There may be a Roman Catholic bishop in the

(1) The Bishop's letter was published in the *Times* of January 31, 1876.

parish with half a dozen priests residing with him, and a Roman Catholic cathedral with a congregation of a thousand Irish people every Sunday. There may be a Unitarian minister and a hundred of his congregation among the "twenty thousand souls." The parish may be dotted over with Methodist, Baptist, and Independent chapels. There may be three times as many people in the non-established churches on Sunday morning and evening as there are in the parish church. But the tradition of the days when the parish priest was really the priest of the parish, retains its hold upon the mind of the vicar. He cannot look the actual facts of his position in the face. If he did, and if he shaped his language according to them, he would unintentionally become a promoter of the movement for Disestablishment.

Perhaps the best way of bringing home to one's mind the position of the Establishment as a whole is to look at the position of a parochial clergyman. By his own acknowledgment, by his own claims, and by universal consent, it is his duty to provide religious instruction and celebrate religious worship for the whole parish. It is on this ground that he receives his clerical *status* and his clerical income. This is the only explanation of his exceptional position and privileges. But there is a large section of his parishioners to whom he never dreams of offering religious instruction, and to whom he knows it would be useless to give any invitation to unite with him in worship. To them he is a heretic; doctrines and practices which he denounces as "fond things vainly invented, and grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God," are to them among the most sacred parts of their religion; to them he is a mere imitation priest; and his claims to priestly authority they regard with invincible contempt. There is another section of his parishioners whose minds are finally made up to reject a creed for their rejection of which he menaces them on every great festival of the Church with eternal perdition. There is another section of them who are firmly persuaded that the service he uses in the administration of infant baptism encourages a most pernicious superstition. There is another section who, while agreeing with these in their protest against the service, go further still, and are fully persuaded that infants ought not to be baptized at all.

Can it be imagined that these people can regard with equanimity the presence in the parish of a clergyman who is legally invested with a position which their own ministers cannot claim, who is supported by funds which are declared to be intended to make provision for the spiritual interests of all of them, but whose services they are obliged to decline? Is it to be supposed that they can regard his position as anything else than an injury to themselves? Ought any one to be astonished if they maintain that the property

from which he receives his income is unjustly appropriated? Can a fair-minded statesman, with whatever indifference he may regard the theological differences of the sects, honestly say that these people have not sufficient reason for complaint?

Their case is even stronger than it appears from this statement of it. To say that they derive no advantage from the official who receives an income and a certain status to take charge of their spiritual interests is not enough. They believe that his religious teaching and the religious services which he conducts are in many particulars positively mischievous to the interests which are entrusted to his care. Their objections to the ecclesiastical polity which he represents, or to his teaching, or to his mode of conducting worship, are so strong that they have set up churches of their own. Their grievance is not merely that they receive no benefit from the national arrangements for the promotion of their religious welfare, but that under these arrangements the resources of a national institution and the whole weight of that national authority with which the clergy are invested, are thrown on the side of religious doctrines which they believe to be erroneous, and of an ecclesiastical organization of which they strongly disapprove. Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Unitarians, members of the Society of Friends, Romanists, are all maintaining a creed, a polity, a form of worship to which the State is positively hostile. They are tolerated by the law, but the law covers the country with a clergy charged with the duty of condemning as erroneous what these nonconforming communities hold to be the most sacred truth, and with the duty of defending as true what these communities condemn as false. There is a religious quarrel between the State and half the people who care sufficiently for religious observances to attend public worship with any regularity. The State is on one side; they are on the other. The quarrel is not accidental and temporary. The malcontents have constructed at great cost permanent organizations to assert the various forms of faith and worship to which the State is antagonistic. They have forced the State to tolerate them.

I ask again, Can any statesman imagine that the people outside the ecclesiastical Establishment will feel no sense of wrong? Their grievance is not against the clergy but against the State. Their principles and their traditions lead them to recognise and to respect in others that freedom of religious thought which they claim for themselves; but when the State takes sides with one religious community against them all, they resent it as an injustice.

But the adherents of the "sects" who number a fourth of the population, and the people who go to church who number another fourth, are equalled in number by those who neglect public worship altogether. Of these there are many, no doubt, who think that

religious faith is an excellent thing for mankind generally, that it encourages many virtues which are of great value to society, and is a strong support of social order; but having no faith themselves they doubt whether the institutions of worship would be maintained, especially among the poor, to whom they imagine religion is most necessary, if the State withdrew its aid from the clergy. These persons are favourable to the maintenance of the Establishment as they are favourable to the maintenance of the police. There are others, again—not very many, I imagine—whose faith in the Christian revelation is strong and deep, but whose religious life is solitary and recluse. They recognise no obligation to unite with others in worship. Those intense religious sympathies, which, apart from any obligation, make common prayer and common praise a necessity and a delight, have never stirred their hearts. But since they see that most men, who have any religious earnestness, have an instinctive longing to unite in public acts of devotion, and appear to derive some benefit or satisfaction from the religious stimulus or instruction of preaching, they think it expedient that there should be a national church. The loose, desultory kind of religious fellowship which exists among the adherents of a national church seems to them the next best thing to absolute religious reserve and solitude. The strong and vital union which binds together the members of most of the “sects” repels them. They are favourable to the maintenance of the Establishment, because while it affords some satisfaction to the social religious instincts it leaves the individual very much alone.

These two classes, however, are very far from exhausting that half of the nation which has renounced or never formed the habit of public worship. There is a considerable number of persons who have consciously abandoned all religious faith. There are, in all probability, still more who while claiming to retain what they describe as religious faith, reject the symbols and creeds of every church commonly recognised as Christian, reject the creed of Mr. Martineau as categorically as they reject the creed of Cardinal Manning. In addition to these, who are positively hostile to the religious ends for which the Establishment exists, there are vast masses who regard these ends with indifference, and whose strength is wholly absorbed in business, in pleasure, or in the common anxieties and sorrows of life. Those who, for whatever reason, desire the Church to be maintained for the sake of other people, though they never attend its services themselves, form, in all probability, an insignificant fraction of that class of the population which I am now considering. It comes therefore to this:—Half of the people attend public worship of some kind, and of these, half refuse to attend the service of the national Church; and the enormous majority of the

remaining half are either actively hostile to the existence of the Establishment or sluggishly indifferent to it.

The injustice of perpetuating the national Church now that it has become the Church of a mere section of the people, is not the only ground on which Liberationists press for Disestablishment. The existence of the national Church provokes religious persecution, and covers religious persecution with what is very naturally regarded as a legal sanction. The State is on the side of the faith and polity of the dominant sect, and, to that extent, is hostile to all other sects. By the encouragement and aid which are given to one church, it does its best to depress and to defeat all other churches. In doing this it employs the authority of law and its power to dispose of public property. Landlords who refuse farms to dissenting tenants may fairly say, that they are only acting in the spirit of the ecclesiastical policy of the nation. The power of the State is used to maintain the Establishment; the power of the landowner may be used just as legitimately for the same purpose. The evil spirit is contagious. How it works was illustrated very lately in a speech delivered, not by a Birmingham agitator, but by the President of the Wesleyan Conference. "He knew cases in which Methodists had had their names placed on the lists of nomination for high civic offices, and their names had been struck out simply on the ground that they were Methodists. On the same ground, also, Methodist farmers had been driven from their farms; and Methodist shopkeepers had been compelled to close their shops, orders having gone forth that nobody was to trade there. He could, within three days, fill sixteen pages of the *Times* newspaper with accounts of oppression of the like kind." The *Watchman*, the weekly organ of the Wesleyans, and a newspaper which is well known to be extremely moderate in its political and ecclesiastical principles, sustains these charges in a leading article. "There are very many villages in England," it says, "in which it is impossible to get a bit of land on which to build a chapel; and if a farmer opens his house for a prayer-meeting, or his barn for preaching, he will probably have to leave his farm and all his unexhausted improvements." It is impossible for a Nonconformist minister of any denomination to travel through a rural district of England without hearing innumerable stories of the annoyances and oppression to which his fellow Nonconformists are subjected—annoyances which are often so petty as to provoke contempt rather than anger, oppression sometimes so cruel as to justify fierce indignation.

Religious bigotry will, of course, exist in the absence of an ecclesiastical Establishment. Protestants will be unjust to Roman Catholics, and Roman Catholics to Protestants, the orthodox to heretics, and heretics to the orthodox, though the State may

take no part in the strife. But religious prejudice and zeal appear to have far less to do with the wrongs inflicted on Nonconformists than the spirit of politico-ecclesiastical partisanship. When a landlord tells an applicant for a farm that "it is essential the tenant should be a Churchman, and have £10 an acre of unencumbered capital," he may, perhaps, sometimes be as anxious that the tenant should actually go to church as that the capital should be actually put upon the land; but I hazard very little in saying that in most cases the condition imposed is satisfactorily fulfilled if the tenant keeps away from the village chapel, though he may never enter the village church. The landlord seldom cares very much about making his estate a settlement of Anglican saints; but the Church is one of the institutions of the country; the clergyman is the authorised and official religious teacher of the parish; dissent is insubordination, a revolt against authority; and the same spirit which makes Dissenters worship in the way they think best is very apt to make them vote as they think and not as they are told. Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, are at least as zealous for their religious faith as Churchmen; but who has ever seen a letter in which the applicant for a farm was told that "it is essential the tenant should be a Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, and have £10 an acre of unencumbered capital"?

The spirit which in favourable circumstances leads to persistent and systematic persecution, has effects of another kind, but hardly less mischievous, where public opinion is too vigilant and Nonconformity too strong for persecution to be possible. I think that Dean Stanley has somewhere said that the Establishment has the advantage of keeping the Church in the main current of the national life. The argument, whoever invented it, is a very favourite one with Broad Churchmen. It is rather a dangerous argument for the friends of the Establishment to handle. It has two edges, and the one which cuts the fingers of the Liberationists is not the sharpest. There is a sense in which it is only too true that Nonconformists have been separated from "the main current of the national life." Their separation is an evil for the nation as well as for themselves. But to ground on this fact an argument for the perpetuation of the Establishment, is a logical audacity which it would be hard to parallel.

Yes, the Nonconformists have lost the advantage of being in the main current of the national life. But why? The Corporation Act excluded them from municipal offices; the Conventicle Act forced them to celebrate their worship in a secrecy as deep as that in which conspirators hatch their plots; the Five Mile Act drove their ministers into solitary parts of the country; the Test Act excluded them from all civil, naval, and military employments. It is not surprising that Churchmen should have one advantage over Non-



conformists—the advantage of having been for two hundred years in the main current of the national life. Nonconformists were excluded from the national universities, and compelled to get what education they could in private academies—situated often in obscure towns—where ten or twenty young men, all of the same religious faith and traditions, received the teaching of one or two learned men who were not likely to know much about the main current of the national life. Even these academies provoked the jealousies or the fears of the dominant sect, and an Act was passed for their suppression. Queen Anne died on the very day the Act was to have come into operation. Never, perhaps, was a political thanksgiving more sincere or more fervent than that which Thomas Bradbury offered in Fetter Lane Chapel that morning. He had met Bishop Burnet in Smithfield before service, and said to the kindly prelate, “I am thinking whether I shall have the constancy and resolution of that noble company of martyrs whose ashes are deposited in this place, for I most assuredly expect to see similar times of violence and persecution, and that I shall be called to suffer in a like cause.” The Bishop told him the Queen was dying, and promised that as soon as she was dead he would send a messenger to Fetter Lane; Bradbury was still preaching when the messenger reached the gallery of the chapel, and dropped the handkerchief from the front gallery, which was to be the sign that the Queen was no more. In the prayer after the sermon, the Nonconformist gave thanks for the deliverance of the nation, and invoked the blessing of God on George I. and the House of Hanover. It is not difficult to explain how it has happened that the Established Church has the inestimable advantage which is claimed for it.

Nor is it any reply to remind us that this happened in 1714, more than a hundred and sixty years ago, and that since the accession of the House of Hanover, the State has pursued a more just and kindly policy. It is true that the worst and most cruel laws enacted in the interest of the national Church were repealed when William III. came to the throne, and that the re-action under the reign of Queen Anne was checked by her death. But the struggle to remove disabilities imposed upon the refusal to conform to the national Church, has lasted down to our own times, and the exclusive spirit has survived exclusive laws. We are still “Two Nations,” and the division will last as long as the Establishment lasts.

The lines which separate the adherents of the privileged Church from the rest of the nation, are not so firm and so strong as they were a generation ago. The provincial spirit on both sides is giving way. Churchmen read the books of Nonconformists; Nonconformists read the books of Churchmen; in the great commonwealth of literature, ecclesiastical prejudices are largely forgotten. The intenser religious earnestness which has been manifested, both inside and

outside the Church, during the last thirty years, if it has added something to the vehemence of theological controversy, has made Christian men of all churches vividly conscious that they have a common faith, common hopes, and a common religious life. Non-conformists who are very vigorous Liberationists do honour to the integrity, the sanctity and the zeal which are found among the clergy of the Establishment; Churchmen who think that the success of the Liberation movement would inflict immeasurable harm upon the country, are equally just and generous to their opponents. It has been discovered that men may be firmly opposed to each other in this controversy, and yet remain hearty friends in private life; that they can dine together, borrow each other's books, discuss the questions at issue between them without heat, and regard each other with cordial affection and esteem.

But, after all, the force of individual influence is powerless against a great national institution. Let one class of the community retain privileges which have ceased to have any justification in the actual condition of the nation, and the possession of privilege will encourage violence and oppression. Let another class be discouraged and wronged and the sense of injury will create distrust and resentment.

Centuries ago it may have been expedient that "the main current of the national life" should be deepened and strengthened by politico-ecclesiastical embankments. This is a theoretical opinion which for the moment I do not care to dispute. Our contention is, that the embankments are now in mid-stream; that instead of improving the political navigation, they make it dangerous; that the river has broken through the old works, and has made a second channel for itself. If there was ever a time when, for the sake of perfecting our national and social unity, it was wise to have a national Church, that time has for ever gone by. The national Church is the occasion of our most angry political conflicts, and of the most mischievous of our social schisms.

Perhaps one of the simplest and most obvious illustrations of the disappearance of all those conditions which may have made a national Church expedient in the earlier periods of our history, is to be found in the present constitution of Parliament. So long as the Church remains national, Parliament must retain its present authority in all ecclesiastical affairs. The ecclesiastical functions of Parliament are an essential element in the constitution of the existing establishment. But an assembly less competent to be entrusted with the government of the Church, it would be difficult for human ingenuity to devise. The answer is that the arrangement exists. If Parliament had not been discharging high ecclesiastical functions for centuries, Dean Stanley himself would hardly venture to maintain

that Parliament was the best of all possible assemblies for administering the affairs of a Church. Even the present Parliament, though largely returned in the interest of the clergy, hardly appears to possess the characteristics and qualifications which we look for in a great ecclesiastical court.

Theoretically, the ecclesiastical functions of Parliament may be indefensible, but are there adequate practical reasons for a change?

The challenge is perfectly fair, and ought to be met. We maintain that Parliament is overtaken, that the House of Commons has neither time nor strength to get through the necessary public business of the nation, and that while important measures like the Merchant Shipping Bill of last session are postponed from year to year, because there is not adequate opportunity for discussing them, it is a great evil that the House should be required to regulate the ecclesiastical affairs of a fourth of the population. The Act for the Regulation of Public Worship, passed in 1874, attracted public attention, and every one knows how many nights it consumed, and how it obstructed general political business. But the number of ecclesiastical measures brought before Parliament every session is very much greater than most people suppose. The number of the ecclesiastical measures which become law, and which therefore get read a first, second, and third time, and pass through committee, is very considerable. In 1871 there was an Act to amend the law relating to ecclesiastical dilapidations; the amending Act was amended in 1872. In 1871 there were also Acts to amend the law relating to the Tables of Lessons and Psalter contained in the Prayer Book; to amend the law relating to sequestration of ecclesiastical benefices; to amend certain Acts relating to church-building; to amend and define the law relating to private chapels belonging to colleges, schools, hospitals, asylums, and other public institutions; and an Act providing for the resignation of clergymen incapacitated for service, and determining their pensions; in the next year there was a similar Act providing for the resignation of deans and canons. In 1872 there was an Act making it illegal for any clerk in orders, parish clerk, vestry clerk, or other persons, to demand fees for baptism, or for the registration of baptism, in certain churches and chapels of the Church of England by law established, the vested rights of the present holders of any office who may be entitled by any Act of Parliament to claim fees being respected. In the same year there was an Act securing the free use of seats in certain churches; an Act amending the Act of Uniformity; and an Act for the alteration of the boundaries of dioceses. In 1873 there was an Act to amend a previous Act, passed in the present reign, for the regulation of cathedrals, and to facilitate the endowment of canonries by private benefactions; an Act for amending the Tithe Commutation Acts with respect to market gardens; and an Act for

amending the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Acts of 1840 and 1850, and for other purposes. In 1874, in addition to the Public Worship Regulation Act, there was an Act for extending to the present Bishop of Calcutta the regulations of a previous Act relating to the leave of absence of Indian bishops; an Act providing that, except under certain defined conditions, no person ordained by any bishop other than a bishop of the Church of England or Ireland, shall officiate as priest or deacon in any church or chapel in England. In 1875 there was an Act making perpetual an Act passed six years before, providing for the resignation of bishops; an Act for the creation of a new bishopric of St. Albans; and an Act providing for returns relating to ecclesiastical fees, and for other purposes. How many ecclesiastical bills have been before Parliament during the last four or five years, which have been defeated on the second reading, or been extinguished in committee, I have no means at hand for ascertaining; but the *Times* of this very morning (February 17) contains an illustration of the way in which the time of Parliament is consumed by the defeated as well as the successful attempts at ecclesiastical legislation. The debate on Mr. Beresford Hope's bill for the increase of the episcopate extends over four columns; it occupied nearly the whole of an afternoon sitting, and was then practically withdrawn.

Private members are complaining that they have not the chance of getting a day for measures in which their constituents are deeply interested; and in July the Government will announce with profound regret that important bills must be withdrawn because the press of business has made it impossible to find time to discuss them. If a clerk were to spend a couple of hours every day copying music for a church choir when he ought to be copying invoices, he would be just as guilty of robbing his master as if he took money out of the till. The time of Parliament belongs to the nation just as the time of a clerk belongs to the manufacturer who employs him; and the work of the nation suffers, and suffers severely, through the time which Parliament is giving to the ecclesiastical business of a fraction of the people.

There is another reason for relieving Parliament of its present ecclesiastical functions, a reason which to many persons will have great urgency. It is plainly impossible for Parliament to discharge these functions effectively. During the present reign it is probable that at least three hundred public acts relating to ecclesiastical persons and ecclesiastical affairs have become law. But nearly all these measures deal with such matters as church building and church dilapidations; tithes and loans for church purposes; pensions for bishops, deans, and incumbents, who resign their offices; the boundaries of bishoprics, archdeaconries and parishes; fees for ordination, fees for baptism, fees for consecration of churches. Parliament has

not touched, Parliament dare not touch, any of the greater subjects affecting the faith, the discipline, or the worship of the Church. We have a national institution which the nation cannot direct or control. The national ecclesiastical establishment, in all that most deeply affects the religious thought and life of the nation, is still in the hands of the Parliament and bishops of the Restoration. Clarendon, Sheldon, Gunning and Morley are still its rulers.

The case requires to be stated even more strongly. The Church of the Restoration was really the Church of Charles I., of James I., of Elizabeth. The Act of Uniformity of 1662 re-established its polity, its creeds, its articles, its worship, just as they stood a century before. But, during the last three hundred years a great change has passed upon Protestant Christendom. The change amounts to revolution—not in religious faith, but in religious opinion—a revolution which in some of its aspects is quite as grave as that which divided western Christendom in the seventeenth century. Orthodox Protestant theologians retain the substance of the creed of the Reformers, but the definitions of nearly all the principal articles of that creed have been re-cast. The method of theology has been gradually modified, and whenever there is modification of scientific method there will be modifications of scientific results. Contrast the sermons, the theological treatises, the commentaries, produced by every school in the English Church during the Carolinian and Elizabethan periods, with the books written by theologians of every school in the English Church in our own time, and it will be obvious that English theology has not escaped from the influences by which the theology of continental Protestantism has been transformed. Evangelicals do not write about free will, original sin, and the atonement, in the way in which the Calvinistic reformers in the reign of Elizabeth wrote about the same doctrines. The Evangelicals write in another way because they think in another way. Broad Churchmen stand on different ground altogether from that on which the Latitudinarians of the seventeenth century stood, and even if it were not so, Latitudinarianism had nothing to do with shaping the Book of Common Prayer. The High Anglicans and Ritualists approach, no doubt, very near to the position of the Laudian divines; but the divines of the sixteenth century, to whom we owe the Prayer Book, would have regarded both Laud and the Ritualists with dismay and horror.

The authoritative documents of the English Church are the expression of a condition of religious life and thought which has altogether passed away. The various elements which were blended in the religious faith and feeling of the men who drew up these documents or compiled them from materials already in existence, are now divided among hostile theological parties. The Evangelical may

conscientiously believe that the offices of the Church can be satisfactorily explained; the Ritualist may conscientiously believe that the Articles can be satisfactorily explained away. It would be unjust to lay a moral indictment against the men of either party; to their own Master they stand or fall. Among the Evangelicals and among the Ritualists there are men to whose personal honour and integrity it would be an impertinence for me to bear testimony. But it remains true that the Articles are the expression of the Reformation theology which the Ritualists abhor, and that the Offices are stained with those Romish superstitions which the Evangelicals hold to be infinitely perilous to the spiritual interests of mankind. Nor do those who walk in middle paths, those represented by the late Bishop of Winchester and the late Dean Hook, reproduce the precise type of faith and the precise religious temper which created the Prayer Book. The book, as a whole, is very unlike the ancient creeds which are contained in it. The creeds were the expression of a coherent and tolerably complete theological movement, the results of which are permanently absorbed in the theological thought of Christianity,—a movement deriving a real unity from the life which inspired it, and of which it was the organic manifestation. But the Prayer Book was a premature though necessary attempt to reconcile conflicting forces. It arrested the disappearance and decay of the old modes of thought; it arrested the free development of the new. What the Prayer Book was in the days of Elizabeth it is now. The Church, the nation, has grown in many ways; the formularies which profess to contain the highest thought of both the nation and the Church remain unchanged. What is more serious still, while the Establishment lasts there is no power which can change them.

These facts are, I venture to think, of very serious significance to the loyal and devout adherents of the national Church. They are also of very serious significance to the nation generally. So long as Parliament refuses to surrender its present ecclesiastical functions, the incoherence of the formularies of the Church will remain without a remedy; and this incoherence will continue to inflict upon the country evils from which it has suffered too long. Ecclesiastical parties will continue to exchange bitter recriminations. They will continue to call each other traitors. They will continue to denounce each other as men who eat the bread of the Church and are false to its principles. The interpretation which is put upon quarrels of this kind by people who know nothing of the subtleties of theological controversy is very simple, very unjust, very mischievous; they conclude that the adherents of one party, at least—perhaps of both—are consciously dishonest. The effect on the morality of the country is in the highest degree disastrous. The only cure is for Parliament to renounce the functions which it is

powerless to discharge, and to remit to the clergy and laity of the Church the management of their own affairs.

This paper would extend far beyond its necessary limits if I attempted to discuss the pleas which are urged on the other side; they must be dismissed in a few sentences.

There is first the plea that to disestablish the Church would be to create an independent religious corporation, possessing such enormous power and such enormous wealth that it would be a permanent menace to the State. At present, however, as I have already said, there is no such corporation as the Church of England. To provide for the creation of such a corporation in an Act of Disestablishment does not seem an imperative necessity; and under what conditions a free episcopal Church should be legally incorporated is an open question. To make any such provision for the re-endowment of the English Church as was made in the Act of 1869 for the re-endowment of the Irish Church would, I believe, be contrary to all principles of sound policy; the State would discharge its duty by providing for the ample recognition of the vested rights of the clergy individually. Why a disestablished Church, if incorporated, should give more trouble to statesmen than the present established Church I cannot understand. There is no reason to suppose that the clergy would act with greater unanimity in political contests than at present, or with a more exclusive regard to Church interests. Their political authority and their motives for engaging in political struggles would be diminished.

A second plea is, that a disestablished and disendowed Church would be unable to provide for the maintenance and encouragement of theological learning. It is alleged, that the theological literature produced by Nonconformists is greatly inferior to that produced by the clergy of the National Church; and that, as a class, the clergy are far more scholarly than the Nonconformist ministers. There would be much more force in this allegation if Nonconformists had not been excluded till very lately from the rewards and honours of the national universities, and if they were not excluded still from many of the positions which are appropriated to men who have won university distinction.

But whatever neglect of theological learning can be charged against the Nonconformists of the present century is the result of very obvious causes. We have many cultivated and able men, many accomplished and refined women, in our churches, but we have worked, for the most part, among the poor and the uneducated. Both in the great towns and in the rural districts, we have collected our congregations from among those whom the National Church had permitted to sink into the grossest ignorance and irreligion. "The common people" have heard us gladly. The rapidity with which, early in this century, we formed church after church in every

part of the kingdom compelled us to disregard the traditions which we had inherited from our fathers—traditions which affirmed the necessity of a learned ministry. We found that devout and zealous men who had native intellectual vigour and native force of character often became very efficient preachers and pastors, though they had little Latin, less Greek, and no Hebrew. To have refused to entrust such men with ministerial responsibilities would have been to leave innumerable congregations without any minister at all. There was no time to give them an elaborate education. Many of them came to us too late in life for an elaborate education to be of any service to them. We did our best to give them some knowledge of theological science and some knowledge of how to preach, and some of them became not only good preachers but great preachers, and did a work which the most accomplished Christian scholars might envy. Gradually we raised the Academies established by our predecessors in evil times into Colleges; and in parts of the country where no Academies existed, new colleges were founded. Our people have shown a noble generosity in establishing these institutions for the education of their ministers; but it must be acknowledged that our educational arrangements are still very defective. They could hardly have been made otherwise. We have done what we could.

It must also be acknowledged that while some of our laity appreciate the importance of theological learning, the great majority, in all probability, do not. Vast numbers of them have had a most imperfect education. Through the virtues which they have learned to practise since they came to us, many of them have become rich; but they have not been able to escape from the effects of their early disadvantages. They cannot be persuaded to tolerate a dull preacher simply because he is learned. As yet we have comparatively few positions for men who wish to give their whole life to scholarship. With all this, the intellectual activity and earnestness of Non-conformist ministers and their general culture—I do not speak of their technical scholarship—give them a claim to the respect of the community. Nor are we without men whose learning is both extensive and exact.

But if *we* have failed—we who have been excluded from the universities, we who have worked among the poor and among the less educated of the middle classes, we who have been under the strain and stress which have come upon us from the very triumphs we have won among the irreligious masses of the people—if *we* have failed in the cultivation of theological learning, is it reasonable to fear a similar failure in a church starting with such traditions and with such advantages as would belong to the disestablished Church of England? Would the laity of that Church be insensible to the advantages of theological scholarship? Would the clergy of that Church receive no opportunities for acquiring it? Would there be



no canonries, no deaneries, no professorships for the Lightfoots, and the Westcotts, and the Liddons, and the Puseys of the generation which followed disestablishment? The fear seems to me unworthy of the descendants of the illustrious scholars and theologians whose names are the glory of the Anglican Church.

Those who argue that the Establishment should be maintained for the sake of the cultivation of learning, will probably find it difficult to show that the Establishment has really done as much as is sometimes assumed, either for the diffusion of general scholarship or the advancement of theological investigation. Since the beginning of the present century, at least, the universities of Germany have been the theological teachers of Europe. Within that period the Anglican Church has had a few great names—some of the greatest are the names of living men; but both the Churchmen and the Nonconformists of this country will acknowledge that the services which English scholars have rendered to theology during the last fifty years do not admit of comparison with the services which have been rendered by the scholars of Germany. It should be remembered, too, that whatever culture may distinguish the English clergy, they have been educated by the universities, not by the Establishment. The universities will remain when the Church is disestablished. And the universities have done at least as much as the Establishment—probably much more—for the creation of a valuable theological literature. Professor Lightfoot has not been diverted from his theological pursuits by his appointment to a canonry of St. Paul's; but he would not have abandoned them if the canonry had never been conferred upon him. Dr. Ellicott left off writing commentaries when he was made a bishop.

A third plea in defence of the Establishment rests upon the assumption that if the Church were disestablished a large proportion of the population would be left without the institutions of religious instruction and worship, and would soon relapse into vice and irreligion. The poorer districts of great towns would, it is alleged, be worse off than they are now, and the spiritual condition of the villages would become desperate.

But what justification of these gloomy apprehensions can be produced? Looking back upon the last hundred and fifty years, there seems to me to be the clearest proof that, for some reason or another, the Anglican Church has far less religious power over the poor than any of the sects that profess the evangelical creed. It is among the poor that the sects have acquired their principal strength; they have acquired it with resources which originally were absolutely contemptible when compared with the resources of the Establishment; they have acquired it notwithstanding the persistent and bitter persecution which has been inflicted on Dissenters by a very large section of the Established clergy and their friends.

If the adverse influence of the Establishment were out of the way, the Nonconformists would probably do more for the poor than ever. The clergy of the disestablished Church would probably do at least as much as they are doing now. In the towns a considerable part of the work which the clergy are already doing in the poorest districts has been originated within the last thirty years by voluntary zeal, and is largely maintained by endowments which have been received within the same period from voluntary benevolence. Recent endowments from voluntary sources the disestablished Church ought to retain, and it is certain that Disestablishment will be favourable instead of adverse to the enterprise and generosity of Churchmen. It is about the rural districts that the defenders of the Establishment have the greatest fear. But if the Church has any real faculty for exercising religious influence on the agricultural poor, surely the Church can maintain the ground which it already holds in rural districts; for the ground which the Nonconformists now hold in these districts has been won by a desperate struggle against the prejudice and hostility of the people on whom tenants are dependent for their farms, village shopkeepers for custom, and agricultural labourers for their weekly wages. The Nonconformists have drawn together their congregations and built their chapels in the villages, with no other local aid than they could obtain from ploughmen and thrashers, the village grocer or baker, and perhaps a small farmer who was fortunate enough to own the few acres which he cultivated or to have a Liberal nobleman for his landlord. The clergyman has the large farmers to look to, and the squire, and all the great county people in the neighbourhood. If, after the Church has been in possession for three centuries, these wealthy and powerful classes will not find money to support it, the Church must have flagrantly wasted its great opportunities. I believe that they will support it. The Free Church of Scotland, within thirty years after its Exodus, had an income which was nearly twice as large as the income which the Established Church received from the State. English Churchmen are far wealthier than the adherents of the Scotch Free Church. It is surely a calumny to say that their religious zeal is less fervent, or their liberality less generous.

The fourth plea for letting things alone is the plea of politicians. We are told sometimes that it is idle to contend that the majority of the people are wronged by the ecclesiastical policy of the State, for only a minority are agitating for a change, and that until the agitation becomes more general there is no necessity to pay much attention to the agitators. It would be just as reasonable to reply to an argument intended to illustrate the injustice of slavery by alleging that there were no signs of the outbreak of a servile war. Slavery is an injustice whether the slaves resent it or not. In the actual circumstances of the English people the preservation of the Esta-

blishment is an injustice whether those who are wronged by it resent it or not. But the revolt has begun, and even politicians—to say nothing of statesmen—must make up their minds as to how they will meet it.

The reasons why it did not begin earlier and has not spread more rapidly are almost too clear to need explicit statement. Two centuries have not passed by since Nonconformists were oppressed and harassed by an elaborate system of persecuting laws. To the men who at the cost of a Revolution had obtained the repeal of statutes which punished Nonconformity with fine, imprisonment, and exile, the disadvantages and penalties still inflicted upon them for their separation from the national Church appeared so inconsiderable compared with those from which they had escaped, that they were unwilling to risk what they had gained by attempting to gain more. When Nonconformists were no longer afraid that toleration would be withdrawn, it was only natural that their first movements for a larger liberty should be directed to the repeal of particular statutes passed in comparatively recent times for the repression of Nonconformity. It is also true, no doubt, that the great body of the early Nonconformists were under the control of those ancient traditions which made it the first duty of the civil magistrate to care for the honour and maintenance of religion. The actual form of religion which the magistrate happened to be maintaining was in their judgment very objectionable; but to most of them a State which made no provision for religious teaching and worship would have been as strange and startling a spectre as a School Board which makes no provision for religious teaching and worship appears to be to many of their descendants. What they wanted was a State Church with a Conscience Clause.

They, therefore, gradually plucked up courage to agitate against Dissenting grievances. The agitation for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, for the right to celebrate marriages in their own places of worship, for the abolition of Church rates, and for admission to the Universities—these were the movements which till recently tasked all their strength. And though for more than a generation large numbers of Nonconformists have felt that by the maintenance of the Establishment the State inflicted injustice upon themselves, and impaired rather than strengthened the authority of religious faith in the nation generally, their resentment against the greater wrong has concentrated itself and has worked itself off in the struggle against inferior grievances. These have now nearly disappeared, and before long the Nonconformists will inevitably unite their forces for the supreme contest. The development of Ritualism is kindling excitement in many who have been indifferent to the Liberation Movement till now, and is raising the zeal of some of the older Liberationists to a white heat. The fire is certain to spread and spread fast.

The line of defence which is assumed by those who have undertaken the defence of the Establishment is forcing the controversy in a direction which must interest and attract all those who care nothing for ecclesiastical theories, and who have hitherto regarded the Liberation dispute as a mere sectarian quarrel. Of late years the masses of the people have not clearly understood that the clergy of the Church of England are the national clergy. They have cared too little either for Church or Dissent to appreciate the difference between the relations of the parochial clergyman and the relations of the Methodist minister to the State. The Church has practically become a sect, and the people have forgotten that it is still a national institution. The defenders of the Establishment just now seem to have forgotten it too. They are asserting that the property which gives a revenue to the clergy is the property of Churchmen in the same sense in which Methodist chapels are the property of Methodists. The Liberationists are, therefore, compelled in reply to give great prominence to the national character of the Church, and to the right of the nation to appropriate Church property to other than ecclesiastical uses. In answer to the inquiry, incessantly but most unwisely reiterated by the friends of the Establishment, about the manner in which it is proposed that ecclesiastical property should be disposed of, the Liberationists recommend that the property should be vested in local authorities, and the income devoted to purposes in which all parishioners and burgesses have a common interest. This is an appeal for disestablishment which comes home to men who care nothing for controversies between the Churches. Let me say frankly that the appeal is one for which I have no great liking. It would be infinitely better that the controversy should be slowly determined by large political and religious considerations than that it should be brought—as it is likely to be brought—to a rapid issue by the eagerness of vast masses of the people to use Church property for their own advantage. But when Liberationists are charged with recommending a policy of robbery and spoliation, they cannot submit to the slander quietly. They are bound to show that the nation has as much right to determine how the great mass of Church property should be appropriated as it has to determine the appropriation of the Consolidated Fund. The idea has begun to take hold of the popular mind. It is an idea which is likely to awaken popular passion—passion which, if it becomes hot, may refuse to listen to the claims of generosity and even to the claims of justice. The friends of the clergy, and all who desire to see an equitable settlement of this controversy, would do wisely to consent to a settlement before the great towns of the kingdom and the people in rural parishes who are complaining bitterly of the pressure of the rates, become too vehemently eager to secure the ecclesiastical revenues for the maintenance of schools or the relief of the poor.

R. W. DALE.

## THE UPPER ENGADINE.

“To flagrantis atrox hora Caniculæ  
Nescit tangelo; tu frigus amabile  
Præbos.”

THE crowd of visitors that spend the summer in the Upper Engadine is continually increasing. Many of them return thither more or less regularly; and nearly all retain some interest in the place and its inhabitants. As I am myself probably the most regular of all the visitors—going to the Engadine each year, and staying there, as a rule, from June till November—it may be possible for me to give some information not unacceptable to those for whom St. Moritz already has an attraction, nor perhaps to those who may intend shortly to visit it for the first time. It is, however, hard to mention all that is needful for the latter class of readers, without stating much that must seem superfluous to the former class. Moreover, St. Moritz being mainly frequented as a health-resort, some account must be given of its climate and iron-waters; and the materials for such an account, being in our case wholly derived from our experience and that of others, and from the statements of experts, have no foundation whatever in medical knowledge of our own. Hence our remarks on this head will be useful only as a reminder to those delicate persons who, before going to St. Moritz, have inquired of the best medical authorities; that is, of medical men who, like Dr. Yeo and Dr. Hermann Weber, have made St. Moritz their special study. But very many invalids seek the mountain-cure without taking this precaution; and mischievous results sometimes follow from the wild notions current about the Engadine, and even from the advice of physicians who have not been there. On the whole, therefore, the difficulty of being all things to all readers must be our excuse if, in any instance, we be thought either to poach on the manor of the doctors, or to give a *crambe repetita* of Murray.

Mr. Freshfield, who is certainly no flatterer of the Upper Engadine, affirms that its climate is “the most bracing south of the Arctic Circle.”<sup>1</sup> The statement, however, needs qualification. There are isolated hotels on various spots among the Alps (such as Mürren, Belalp, Eggischorn, and St. Gothard) where the air is little, if at all, less cold—there are hotels on the Riffel and on the Furca and Stelvio passes, where the air is much colder—than in the neighbourhood of any hotel or hospice in the Engadine. Never-

(1) “Italian Alps.”

theless, none of these spots comes anywhere near the Engadine as a bracing place for invalids; for none of them furnishes the same civilised comforts. The Engadine—with its very accessible position and excellent roads, with its numerous and good hotels, with its supply of doctors throughout the year (of one or more English doctors generally during the season), and with its chemist's shop (the highest in Europe)—defies all comparison on the part of any of the places I have named. Also, among cold places it is distinguished by the dryness of the air, and by the number of its bright days. Moreover, the extent of the valley gives great opportunities for enjoying a change of scene; and this is an advantage in more ways than one. An invalid (in the widest sense of the word) who has succeeded in clambering up to one of the solitary mountain hotels of which I have spoken, is likely soon to get tired of his seclusion, and to want to go elsewhere. But he will probably be unable to dip by halves. He must plunge at once into a low valley, and thus pass suddenly from coolness to heat, and from a rare air to a dense air. In the Engadine, on the other hand, he may avoid these trying changes. For, in the first place, this long valley, with its numerous villages and its manifold variety, has attractions which may well detain him till the summer heat is quite over. It has, moreover, what may be termed a graduated scale of bracingness; for, as will be seen presently, it contains at least one Hospice where the air is much more bracing than at St. Moritz, and very much more so than at Samaden. And, secondly, when the Engadine is left, the descent to the low ground may be broken by a stay of a night or two at one of the villages (such as Mühlen or Tiefenkasten) between St. Moritz and Chur. It should be added that there appears to be no place at all like St. Moritz, on the Pyrenees or on any other European range; and that—to judge by the number of Americans who come to the Engadine, and by the information with which some of them have favoured me—there is no such place in America. Hence, from the point of view of those delicate persons who can bear, and who require, bracing *ad libitum*, the Upper Engadine may be described as the summer resort of the world; it is without an equal anywhere, and, for Englishmen at least, without a second.<sup>1</sup>

\* (1) Davos, the only other place where the various requirements of a summer resort are in any degree combined, is, in every one of them, inferior to the Engadine. It has, further, what our countrymen would find a great drawback—its hotels are almost exclusively filled with Germans; and the passion of Germans for shutting all windows is most trying to Englishmen (especially invalids), and is perpetually the cause of disputes. Wherever Englishmen and Germans meet in hotels these disputes arise. Sometimes, in defence of *fainting* ladies, Englishmen are driven to break windows with their elbows; and I am assured that, three years ago, at a German watering-place, one of the disputants so far forgot himself as to knock his antagonist down. Even at the

We may well be amazed that a place thus utterly unique should appear so completely to have dropped out of the tourist's map, that many English travellers who visited the Alps some twenty years ago, not merely never saw the Engadine, but never so much as heard of it. It was not always thus unknown. The Romans are said to have used the iron-waters. I heard an accomplished archæologist maintain that the victory which was won by Tiberius and Drusus in the Rhætian Alps, and which Horace has celebrated in two of his finest odes, must have taken place in the Engadine. The end of the valley near the Maloja Pass might well have served for a battle-field; but I am aware that the actual site of the battle is generally placed further east. At any rate, the Engadine lay in the Rhætian Alps; and with that entire district the Romans were familiar. At Chur (Curia Rhætorum), there is a tower in the Bishop's palace, which is held to be Roman. The village of Bivio (Bivium) on the road to St. Moritz is so called from its marking the point where the roads over the Julier and Septimer passes meet.<sup>1</sup> The Septimer pass was much used by the Romans; and traces are still left of the Roman road. To this day, the language of the people is Romansch, which is commonly described as a mixture of Italian and German, but which is in truth a Latin dialect.<sup>2</sup> It, however, contains a few foreign ingredients; amongst others, an ingredient of Spanish, left by the Spaniards during their occupation of Milan and the Valteline. It should be added that some Engadiners have Spanish blood in them, and that in a few cases the Spanish type of countenance is strongly marked. This is a most impressive fact. In a late number of this Review, Professor Tyndall called attention to the singular phenomenon, that the vibrations of "invisible music" can be transmitted

St. Moritz *Kulm*, where the English are predominant, matters are quite bad enough. It was there contemplated to put the English near the windows in the dining-room, and to separate the Germans from them by a screen. Surely such an arrangement, however unsociable, would be wise. If the English and their excellent kinsmen are so prone to quarrel at watering-places, is it not better that, like Abraham and Lot, they should keep asunder?

(1) It is a curious instance of the inconvenience arising from the conflict of languages in this neighbourhood, that the Italians and the Swiss respectively call the same village by the wholly unlike names of Bivio and Stalla. Some authorities affirm that the word *Julier* is derived, not from Julius Cæsar, but from a local name. Still, the word, if not Latin in its origin, is Latinised in its present form; and its history may be compared with that of the word *Maleventum* (originally derived from the Greek). On the top of the Julier pass are two pillars without any legible inscription, but probably either of Roman or præ-Roman date. Is it possible that those pillars, if they cannot be a last vestige, may mark the site, of the *arces Alpihus imposite tremendis* which Drusus demolished?

(2) Mr. Tylor has kindly called my attention to the fact that the Romansch word *cudesch*, a book, comes directly from the Latin *codex*, and not from any Italian word. He has also favoured me with the beginning of the Romansch national hymn, which resembles Latin so closely that it might almost be given to schoolboys as a specimen of bad Latin for correction.

through a silent rod. It is a yet more stupifying thought, that in the Engadine the *óvvaμus* of the Spanish physiognomy has been unwittingly passed from generation to generation—passed, perhaps through a single line of descent, certainly in spite of numerous inter-marriages with a most un-Spanish race—passed, in at least one instance, by a parent in whom personally the Spanish physiognomy does not appear. So that, though now the Spanish occupation is long since over and forgotten, and is unsuspected even by some who bear the impress of it in their features, still the old Spaniards, being dead, yet speak; *atque, ut cursores, vitai lampada tradunt*.

At the time of the Reformation, the Engadiners espoused the new faith, and offered a brave resistance to the Catholics around. The old Protestant Church of St. Moritz was one of the very southernmost churches of the Reformation; Luther is said to have preached in it. About this period, an event occurred which ultimately worked a complete change in the history of the valley. Paracelsus of Hohenheim discovered (or, some say, rediscovered) the more powerful of the two iron-springs, which now bears his name; and, in 1539, he wrote an account of the iron-waters. In regard to the earlier use of these waters there is much obscurity, and that for a characteristic reason. "It is not improbable that other records of the ancient use of the springs may have existed in the archives of the commune, but it happened that, some time ago, the then President, who, in addition to his municipal duties, also dealt in groceries and small wares, thought the old official books and papers would make excellent wrappers for sugar and soap, and disposed of them accordingly."<sup>1</sup> In the year 1614, the Engadiners took a sudden fancy for travelling.<sup>2</sup> A large number of them—it is said, several thousands, which must have amounted to a complete exodus—emigrated to North Italy, chiefly to Venice, all adopting the single business of shoemaking. They continued this occupation for a century and a half; till, in 1766, their exclusion from Venice forced them to abandon it. Still, however, they formed a sort of guild, and stuck to a single trade; but the trade was a dissimilar one: from cobblers they all became pastrycooks.<sup>3</sup> They were soon the first pastrycooks in Europe; and, to this day, in almost all Continental countries, many of the best pastrycooks' shops are in the hands of Engadiners. But they never penetrated to the British Isles, and this may be one reason why, till within the last few years, our countrymen have been so exceptionally

(1) Pole's "Iron Cure among the Glaciers."

(2) Many of the following facts are derived from "Das Engadin und die Engadiner," an anonymous work written in 1837, seemingly by a German pastor.

(3) As the Gorman pastor phrases it, they took to selling pastry, and other such dainties "as tickle the gums." In several of the neighbouring districts, nearly all the inhabitants are brought up to a single trade; amongst others in Val Bregaglia, whence they emigrate as chimney-sweepers.



ignorant about them. It is said that the old editions of Murray's *Guide* have little information to give about St. Moritz, except that the Protestant church contained the fire-engine. One cause—which was also a sign—of the prevalent want of interest in the Engadine may have been the badness of the roads. Those who know the valley as it is now, may be amused to learn that, as late as forty years ago, it was thought safer to ride than to drive over the pass, and that any stray visitor who might come for the sake of the mineral waters was advised to keep a horse of his own; if the horse was not used to the fare of black bread, oats had to be brought from Chur, as there were few or none in the valley. The post came only once a week, and then only to Ponte; every Thursday, when the weather permitted, the visitors at St. Moritz made an expedition to that distant village, and returned home with their letters.

In this primitive state of society, and in the jealousy and dislike of intruders, the Engadiners were not wholly unlike the Japanese; and withal in the Engadine, as in Japan, the irrepressible foreigner has appeared, and the nineteenth century has followed close on the Middle Ages. At the present day, St. Moritz is easily reached from Chur by either of two excellent roads of about equal length, one over the Albula, the other over the Julier, pass. The former of these roads is often preferred as being grander near the top of the pass. But the Julier road has the great advantage of giving a better first impression of the Engadine. By this route the traveller is at once brought *in medias res*. As he comes down from the pass, he has a fine view of the main valley with its lakes and villages; and on his arrival at Silva Plana he has the opportunity of examining in detail one of the most characteristic of those villages. In many respects the Engadine villages resemble those in other parts of the Grisons. The houses have a half-Italian look; they are solidly built; and, with their frequently renewed coat of whitewash, they present a strong contrast to the dark wooden *châlets* which abound in many parts of Switzerland.<sup>1</sup> Thus far the Oberhalbstein and the Engadine villages are alike. What is peculiar to the latter is a kind of patch-work appearance. The small sunk windows are being replaced by large modern ones; modern doorways, too, are beginning to be substituted for the wide-arched doorways through which carts and sledges are admitted into the primitive entrance-halls, which serve both as coach-houses and as barns; and some of the ancient cottages have the air of being refurbished to delight the eyes of visitors.

When I spoke of the half-Italian look of the villages, I was partly referring to the tall slender campaniles, whose summit is not quite

(1) Mr. Freshfield has well remarked that: "In their passion for whiteness and cleanness, fresh paint and bright flowers, and, I may add, in a certain slow persistency of character, the Eastern Swiss seem to me the Dutch of the mountains."

that of Italian campaniles, but which are more akin to these than to anything else.<sup>1</sup> A good number of these campaniles may be seen during the ascent from Chur; and it is worth while making that ascent on a Sunday morning, in order to witness the hearty devotion that prevails, at least among the women, and especially, I think, among the Catholics. In part of the Grisons, the valleys take it almost in turns to be Catholic and Protestant; and between the Catholics and Protestants there is no friendly feeling. An Engadiner told me that the Protestants of St. Moritz dislike taking even a maid from the Catholic Tiefenkasten; for the Catholics are thought to have "Jesuitical notions of morality." On a ridge, within sight of Tiefenkasten, stands one of the most picturesque of the churches, the Catholic church of Brienz. Nearly all the village has lately been burnt down—a fate not uncommon among the older and less substantially built villages of the Grisons. But, happily, the church is left; and, on its conspicuous height, it looked last year all the more impressive, from its being in solitary grandeur among the ruins. The Catholics, we may be sure, never imitated the Protestant economy by using churches as engine-houses; and I have sometimes thought how triumphantly their controversialists at Brienz must appeal to "the God who answereth by fire," and who spared his undesecrated sanctuary when he was consuming the rest of the village. A small chapel near the neighbouring village of Lenz is described by an old tradition as the scene of a very different deliverance. A peasant, some centuries ago, was leading a kid past this chapel, and, being called away for a few minutes, he tied the kid to the handle of the door. During his absence a wolf attacked the kid, which thereupon in its struggles pushed against the door; the door, opening inwards, let the kid into the chapel; whither, however, the wolf followed. With the courage of despair, the kid jumped over the wolf through the doorway; and thereby, being still tethered, shut the door on its assailant. So the man, on his return, found his kid still safe outside the chapel, and the wolf a prisoner within. It is feared that the captive's right of sanctuary was straightway disregarded.

Perhaps the most surprising feature in many Grisons villages is the wrought ironwork, which often shows great artistic skill, and which contrasts strangely with the otherwise homely exterior of the houses. Some of this ironwork is full two hundred years old; and its present state of preservation is a noteworthy proof of the extreme

(1) In some of these church-towers there are old clocks which strike the hour twice with an interval of a few minutes, in order to facilitate the counting of the strokes. This assistance is not of much use at St. Moritz, as the clock is almost invariably wrong. What at St. Moritz makes the effect most singular is, that this clock is on the Protestant church, and that the Catholic church is hard by. One's first impression was that one heard the stroke of two clocks, the Catholic and the Protestant, both of them much behind the right time, but the Protestant somewhat the less behindhand of the two.

dryness of the air. In a few houses, it is the knockers that attract attention; these represent dragons and other fantastic forms, and hardly any two knockers are alike. But the most striking specimens of the ironwork are the curiously and variously wrought gratings outside the windows. Of the original object of these gratings, the Engadiners give random and discordant accounts. It is variously stated that they were put up by peaceful citizens for protection against robbers, and by jealous husbands for the incarceration of their wives. A pleasanter, and perhaps truer, explanation of the iron grating is, that it was designed as a barrier, behind which a girl might be permitted, without peril of elopement, to talk to her sweetheart, who stood outside. At first sight, this notion seems refuted by the character of the Engadiners. *Ils sont froids, comme leur climat*, was said to me by one who did not love them; and certainly their unromantic temperament would be as little suited as the coldness of their air to the fashion of nocturnal serenades.

From noting the features common to the different villages, we pass on to the distinguishing characteristics of a few of them, so as to enable the reader to judge of their comparative merits; and, that our inquiry may assume a practical shape, let us ask: Whither should our supposed traveller, whom we left at Silva Plana, now direct his steps? If, being content with homely fare, he wishes to see the most picturesque, and one of the most primitive, of Engadine villages, he should visit Sils Maria; where he will find many pleasant excursions, and be within easy reach of the Fex glacier. But, in fact (unless he prefers abiding in his present comfortable quarters at Silva Plana), he will almost certainly take the opposite road—bewareing, however, if he be an Englishman, of the Germanized Kurhaus. At this point, much may be said in favour of Campfer and Samaden, with their excellent hotels. But the air of these villages is less bracing than that of St. Moritz; and the view is less fine than that either at St. Moritz or at Pontresina. On the whole, these last-named villages are by far the most popular in the Engadine. Pontresina is the more central for excursions, and has become the headquarters for guides. St. Moritz is the chief resort of persons more or less delicate.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps we may best sum up our comparison

(1) The *Krone* at Pontresina has long been the favourite hotel of the Alpine club. Their constancy is partly due to their strong personal regard for the landlord and his family. A similar cause has contributed to the immense success of the Kulm Hotel at St. Moritz—the most popular, and, as I think, the most deservedly so, in the Engadine. Both these hotels are scenes of unremitting attention on occasions when such attention is most needed, as the numerous delicate persons who have been at St. Moritz, and the one or more climbers who are annually laid up at Pontresina, because much mountaineering has made them cripples, will gratefully acknowledge. The Kulm Hotel is situated, as its name implies, on the ridge—the highest and driest point—of the main valley. It has one great advantage peculiar to itself—a covered arcade, where, on wet days, people can walk, enjoying the air and the view. Why the new hotels have no such mountain cloister I cannot conceive.

of the different villages, by saying that the division of labour which has arisen between them, and which has adapted each to its special function, should by all means continue. Let athletic mountaineers keep to the easterly villages—Pontresina and Samaden; invalids to the westerly villages—St. Moritz, Campfer, and Silva Plana. One thing, at any rate, is clear. Athletes are of all men the most likely to be irritated by the victimized air and frequent grumblings of invalids; while invalids, if not reminded of their own weakness by the jarring vicinity of exuberant strength, at least object to their wakeful slumbers being broken by heavy footsteps, to the midnight knock at their neighbour's door, and to the other vicarious penalties of mountaineering. Thus athletes and invalids are only an eyesore to each other, and had better live in separate hotels.

We do not, however, mean that invalids and non-invalids should keep asunder in the Engadine, as some Englishmen and some Germans should keep asunder. Happily, mankind is not made up wholly of athletes and invalids. There is a large class of middlemen—of persons, that is, neither very strong nor very weak—who have points in common with both the extremes, and whose presence at health-resorts is invaluable. A person of this kind—one who can be thus touched with the feeling of infirmities—is the best possible companion for nervous sufferers. Indeed, it is he alone who can keep them from becoming victims either to solitary brooding, or to each other's society and a dolorous exchange of confidences, or, far worst of all, to the clumsy and disdainful exhortations and the spurious and odious attempts at sympathy of prigs who do not know what nervousness is. Philanthropy, therefore, should incline the half-invalid towards the delicate region of the valley—the region on the side of St. Moritz. But probably, in fact, his movements will be determined by what he likes in the way of scenery, and in the way of air. On the former point each person must judge for himself. It may be said roughly that the view from St. Moritz is a lake view, and that the view from Pontresina is a glacier view; and, if I personally prefer the view from St. Moritz, my preference is doubtless owing to some of the accidental, often fanciful, associations which regulate that most capricious of tastes—taste for mountain scenery. The comparative worth of the two villages as bracing resorts admits of a more accurate measurement. Pontresina is sometimes preferred in this respect, on the ground of its having close to it an enormous natural refrigerator in the shape of the Rosegg glacier. St. Moritz, it is true, has also a glacier in sight, the Surlei glacier, which is so called from its being over the lake, and which, Cassandras tells us, will one day, from its present rickety height, fall bodily on the Kurhaus—not perhaps to the great dissatisfaction of lovers of Alpine beauty. But this glacier is so

small and so isolated—standing as it does on the top of its dark mountain, like a solitary sugar-plum on the top of a cake—that, while it adds little to the scenery of St. Moritz, it certainly makes no appreciable addition to its cold. The appearance of the Rosegg glacier from Pontresina is far more striking; and this village is often assumed to be more bracing than St. Moritz by reason of its nearness to that glacier and to the Morteratsch. It is probable that these huge glaciers perceptibly affect the temperature of the comfortable little *restaurants*, or small inns, near their respective bases; and, therefore, these *restaurants* make excellent quarters for a person, especially a glacier climber, who finds his own society enough for him, and who wants to compress the utmost amount of bracing into a short time. But I am confident that, in spite of its two glaciers, Pontresina is much less bracing than St. Moritz—the difference being due, not to its having a slightly less altitude, but to its lying in a narrower valley, and being less exposed to the winds. Hence, from the point of view of invalids as such, Pontresina gains little, if at all, by the glaciers. But, from the point of view of artists and of all lovers of scenery, it gains immensely. The view of such vast masses of ice, amid summer scenes and summer heat, leaves certainly a most singular impression, and probably affects us all—even those most accustomed to the sight—more, and in more ways, than we suppose. Some imaginative people bethink them that looking at ice on a hot day makes them feel cool; and it is probably true that with certain temperaments, and under certain conditions, the sight of a glacier during the dog-days—even though it be a mere sight and nothing more—may yet (like Moses' view from Mount Pisgah) be a blessing rather than the reverse. Solomon may have had this feeling when he beautifully observes that snow in harvest is as “a faithful messenger to them that send him: for he refresheth the soul of his masters.” But if the mere sight of snow on distant peaks is here meant—and in what other sense could there be snow at harvest-time in Judæa?—the writer must have gazed too intently at the summit of Lebanon, and at last have grown surfeited and impatient. For, in the next chapter, he changes his simile, and pronounces that “as snow in summer, so honour is not seemly for a fool.” In fact, Solomon's feelings were mixed; and of such mixed feelings in presence of this and similar contrasts, most of us have had experience.

A further consideration, quite as potent as either scenery or air in determining an invalid in the choice of an abode, is the quantity and quality of food. When means of communication were scanty, places of great altitude were deficient in this respect. The defect was indeed very obvious, and was pointed out by Milton in a passage

remarkable in itself, and more remarkable from being put into the mouth of Adam when "fatherly displeased" with the "execrable son" who would one day tempt or force his brethren on to the summit of the tower of Babel :—

" Wretched man ! what food  
Will he convey up thither, to sustain  
Himself, and his rash army ; where thin air  
Above the clouds will pine his entrails gross,  
And famish him of breath, if not of bread ?" (1)

In these physical and economical reflections—reflections, it must be owned, which have the air of proceeding rather from Adam Smith than from Adam the patriarch—two objections are specified which may be urged against all high places from the tower of Babel to St. Moritz—want of food, and want of air. In fact, the charge of giving bad dinners has frequently been brought against the Engadine; and, only a few years ago, when the valley was still a *terra incognita*, and when the natives were as yet unprepared for the bewildering change that was in store for them, the accusation was probably well-founded. But the last few years, one may say, have done the work of centuries; so that now, in all the chief Engadine hotels, the dinners are, not indeed such as to tempt an invalid into over-eating, but generally good enough either for him or for any one else; and what they are generally now, in a few more years they will be universally. In any case, the Engadine is the abode of all others where there is the least excuse for fastidiousness about food; for it unites a physical and a moral condiment, not often found together. In an often-quoted comparison between Plato and mountain air, Joubert says of that air: "Il aiguisé les organes et donne le goût des bons aliments;" and some one else has said that a dinner well talked over is half digested. In both these ways, St. Moritz in the summer should make men omnivorous; for it is then a place—its worst enemy would admit—where the appetite proceeding from mountain air runs no possible risk from mountain solitude.<sup>2</sup> The other count of Adam's indictment against great altitudes is more serious; for the evil, if real, is irremediable. The rarity of the air on mountain-tops was the chief cause of the inveterate prejudice against them. Till quite lately, it was thought incredible that the numerous invalids whose blood requires oxygenation, could gain strength on heights where every cubic foot of air contains less

(1) "Paradise Lost," xii. 74.

(2) People who are now and then dissatisfied with the meat in the Engadine, may be reminded that the milk and cream there are excellent. A few persons, staying on in the autumn, have derived benefit from a modified form of the grape-cure; the kind of grapes medically recommended (*raisins fendants*, as they are called) can be obtained from Meran or elsewhere at small cost.

oxygen than on the plain. Nor indeed does the objection admit of a complete answer. It is quite true that, to meet the various requirements of mountain air, the breath has to be drawn quicker or deeper; also, the pulse beats more frequently; and, in short, the working of the human machine is more rapid. So that a person who seeks health on mountain-tops, may be likened to a trader who puts up with small profits in order to turn over his capital fast. But, whenever such a trader cannot thus recoup himself, he finds the low rate of profit an unmixed evil; and, in like manner, in certain disorders of the respiratory organs and of the heart, the human mechanism cannot increase its speed, and then there is no gain to compensate the loss. A most melancholy case in point occurred in 1872, when a young lady in an advanced stage of consumption was taken to Campfer, and died of sheer suffocation in two days. Likewise, persons whose vigour is impaired by age can seldom quite adapt themselves to these high regions. Even among the Engadiners themselves, it is remarkable how few old people are visible. Except a solitary old woman at Sils Maria, I can hardly remember to have seen any very old person in the valley. The rarity of old *men* should cause little surprise; for many of the men spend the best years of their lives on the plain, and not a few may have suffered from the change of abode, and the sudden and violent change of temperature. But the women mostly stop in the Engadine; and yet women of great age are seldom seen there. I am assured, indeed, that the Engadine contains several aged men and women, who keep indoors. Yet the number of old people who appear must bear a more or less definite proportion to the number of old people who exist; and hence, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the Engadiners, as a rule, are not long-lived. But it by no means follows from this that visitors to the Engadine are committing a slow suicide. I am inclined to think that the normal Englishman should regard dry cold only as an alternative; and that (looking merely to health) he should, when his short change of air and scene is over, take Clough's hint, and—

“Turn to  
England, which may after all be for its children the best.”

That there are very many exceptions to this rule—absolutely very many, though relatively few—and that these exceptional persons are immensely invigorated by a long stay in the Engadine, admits of no question. But what makes them find the air so invigorating, it is hard to say. In truth, St. Moritz is the extreme opposite of the land of the Lotos-eaters; in the former, it “seems” *never* “afternoon,” but almost always early morning. Not, indeed, that the climate is always cold. But there is something about it which imparts a feeling of perpetual motion and excitement. To some

persons—to many on their first arrival—this excitement brings sleeplessness; and to those invalids who require absolute repose and a sort of “afternoon” treatment, it generally proves injurious. But with an opposite class of invalids, the same excitement seems to be the parent of vigour. May not this invigorating restlessness be connected with that quickening of the pulse and winding up of the human clockwork to which we have referred as invariable symptoms on great altitudes? A somewhat similar explanation of the exhilarating influence of mountain air is founded on the comparative absence of atmospheric pressure; it is argued that, on great heights, people have a less weight of air to support, and that they feel like Christian when the burden fell off his back. This solution sounds plausible; nevertheless, there is reason to doubt whether, from the mere diminution of atmospheric pressure—in fact, from the falling of the barometer—any sanitary good can be predicted. The vulgar method of cutting the knot as to the good results of mountain air, is to refer them all to ozone—that unfailing scapegoat of medical ignorance, on whose back climatic effects that cannot be explained are so unceremoniously laid. On heights like the Engadine, there undoubtedly is much ozone; but as to the action of ozone on health, there is still much obscurity. The least ambitious, and probably the wisest, course is provisionally to ascribe the good wrought on invalids by the Engadine air to its cold, dryness, and purity. Other causes of that good—causes which would not operate in an equally cold, dry, and pure air on low ground—may exist; but, if so, they are not fully ascertained.

The popular conceptions are scarcely less hazy about the results of the Engadine climate, than about the climate itself. It is commonly judged of by the specimen presented in July and August; and the snow which sometimes falls, and even lies for a night or two, in that short season, leaves such an impression on witnesses, or at least on reporters, as to cast its white veil over all the fine weather that precedes and follows the snow. Last June, there was a choral festival at Samaden, with singers from all parts of the canton. The 19th was the day fixed for its commencement; but, through the falling of several inches of snow on the 18th—only three days before the longest day of the year—the festival had to be postponed. In 1872 and 1874, the snow lay for a night in August. More than once, I have heard Engadiners say in August that the air was “trop froid pour la neige;” and these words, whatever they exactly meant, have certainly a wintry sound. Perhaps it is natural that snowstorms in the dog-days should beget fears of being snowed up, if not frozen, in autumn. But the fact is, that those whom the Engadine thoroughly suits, would find the Alpine September and October the very months for them. September is almost always the finest month in the year.



It frequently begins with a few wet days; but, in all the five Septembers that I have spent at St. Moritz, the weather was, on the whole, magnificent—cloudless day often following cloudless day, till sometimes, like the faultlessness of Aristides, the uniformity of cloudlessness became wearisome. October is occasionally wet (as in 1873); but more often it is fine. It nearly always has a very fine and warm week—in fact, the Indian summer, or, as the natives call it, the old woman's summer. Several of those who have derived the greatest permanent benefit from St. Moritz, agree that the air only begins to brace them in September; they hold that the actual summer is more stimulating than strengthening; nay, that, in July and August, St. Moritz has only the negative merit of being non-relaxing while other places are relaxing, not the positive merit of being bracing. No absolute rule can be laid down on this subject, both because the temperature varies much in different years, and also because the standard of what braces is relative to the person braced; those whose opinion I quote need much bracing, and fix their standard very high. But, when thus explained, their estimate seems to me not far wrong. At any rate, one happy change comes over the weather in September. The hot Italian winds, so frequent and so trying in the summer, gradually diminish; and the air, as it becomes colder, becomes also stiller. When the winter has fairly set in, there is generally a complete calm; which, indeed, together with the dryness, is what enables many people to bear the winter cold so easily.

Nor is it only on persons seeking to be braced that the Engadine autumn has claims. Many English tourists are, no doubt, restricted as to the time of their holiday; but to a large proportion of them there is, at least, some choice; and to these latter—especially to the painters and botanists among them—I say emphatically that they take their trip to the Engadine at the wrong time. In the late Alpine spring there is a great profusion of wild flowers; but most of these are over (or cut with the hay) before the end of July. Not so very long afterwards begins the autumnal colouring, when the deciduous trees (mainly larches) are seen in that “desolation clothed with loveliness” which belongs quite as much to the Italian autumn as to the autumn of Italian greatness.<sup>1</sup> But the British tourist makes these two beautiful seasons his Scylla and Charybdis, which cannot both be avoided without dexterous steering, but to avoid both of which he somehow contrives. Between these two seasons comes a rather dull interval in August, when there is nothing to relieve the barely distinguishable colouring of the pines and larches, and when, in short, the scenery and sky present a monotony of green and blue. Our countrymen have a way of choosing this dull

[ (1) See Shelley's “Ode to Liberty.”

time for their visit, and can seldom be persuaded that the Engadine has any trees except evergreens, or any autumn worth waiting for. To all these human birds of passage, the snow that often lies for a few hours early in September gives the signal for flight. But, for the "stranger that sojourneth"—for the traveller, that is, who makes a long stay—this passing snow has manifold attractions. First, it is a sign, if not a cause, of that change in the weather from non-relaxing to bracing, of which we have spoken. Secondly, and chiefly, it rids the neighbourhood of the buzzing superfluity both of tourists and of flies. Nor, again, as affecting the scenery, is the September snow otherwise than agreeable; for, when one has in a manner been looking at green for weeks, a glimpse of white is a pleasing variety. It is made all the more pleasing by the thought that there will presently be a yet further change, when the snow begins to melt, and the snow-line appears gradually to climb up the mountain. Thus, the "snow in summer" has associations wholly unlike those of the winter snow; it differs, one may say, from the winter snow, just as the powder wherewith a beauty adorns her hair for a fancy ball, and which is brushed off next morning, differs from the last sad whiteness of age. The winter snow does not fall till the middle of November. It is important to remark that, except occasionally for a few days, the Julier pass is always open. As soon as possible after a heavy fall of snow, the snow-plough does its work; so that communication remains easy throughout the winter. The winters vary greatly in severity. In 1799, the French artillery is said to have crossed the Sils Lake on the ice in the month of May; but such severe cold, so late in the spring, is extremely rare. In the winter of 1871-2, some Cambridge undergraduates came to the Engadine to skate. The skating on the Sils Lake was excellent, and the ice was so clear that through it were seen remains of ancient lake dwellings, said not to be visible in summer through the water.<sup>1</sup> Young Engadiners, being freed in the winter from the incubus of visitors, count it their favourite season, and devote it to sledging parties and dances. So little is the still cold felt, that, once in February, the small party at the Kulm Hotel, after clearing away the snow from a sufficient area, had a picnic on the flat roof—the sun being so hot, that some had to hold up parasols. Encouraged by the

(1) In that winter the skating was unusually good, and lasted long; but, generally, soon after each lake is frozen over, the ice is spoilt by fresh snow. But the lakes begin to bear at different times. I have known a shallow lake (or pond) near Crestalta to bear by the end of October; on the other hand, the St. Moritz lake seldom bears before Christmas. Hence, for skating purposes, the different lakes can be taken in succession. Also, when the Kulm Hotel is kept open in winter, arrangements are made for flooding the croquet ground. But, in fact, this hotel is not kept open unless there are visitors enough to make it pay. After being closed for three successive winters, it was open this last winter, and will probably be open next winter. The Samaden hotel is always kept open; but the visitors are very few.

apparent warmth, one of the ladies tried sketching out of doors; but she was stopped by an untoward event—the paint froze in her brush. It should be further remarked that the food is not less good, while the attendance is much better, in the winter than in the crowded season; and also that the winter cold, though severe in the Engadine, is less so than in Canada.<sup>1</sup> Nor should it be forgotten that, in case an invalid or an invalid's friend should find the cold too intense, an easy descent of six hours over the Maloja pass—a descent all the way, as the pass is lower than St. Moritz—will deposit him in the mild Chiavenna. I am careful to give these details, as extravagant notions are current about the hardships and perils of the Engadine winter, and as cases even occur where persons, having a real object for going to St. Moritz late in the year, are subjected to copious remonstrances, and regarded as bad imitators of the Arctic explorers, imitators who volunteer, without friends or experience, to enter an undiscovered country from whose bourne return is very doubtful.

It appears, then, that, if invalids are to be frozen into health, there is no reason why the candidates for freezing should not go to St. Moritz. But, in fact, at St. Moritz the wintering visitors have been very few. On the other hand, at Davos, where the conditions are nearly the same, their number is great and increasing. It now amounts to about 500, nearly all Germans, and all either invalids or their friends. A large proportion of the invalids are what, in popular language, are vaguely, but conveniently, called consumptive. It is well known that, in the treatment of such cases, medical opinion has undergone a change so astounding as to look like a leap in the dark, or, at best, in the dim twilight. As the remedial agent, the extreme of dry cold has suddenly replaced the extreme of moist heat; and some patients who, only twenty years ago, would have been more or less boiled in Madeira, are now frozen on Alpine heights. How far has this bold experiment succeeded? In the Engadine, certainly, the results (so far as they go) have not been encouraging. Out of the very few who, within my knowledge, have spent winters (or parts of winters) there, at least six have died—a startlingly large portion of the entire number; whereas consumptive cases where the cure of certain disease is itself certain and certainly due to the Engadine winter, are—I will not say unknown—but exceedingly rare.<sup>2</sup> But,

(1) I stayed at St. Moritz till December 4, 1870. That winter being unusually severe, there were, even before I left, more than 40° Fah. of frost, three nights running. But it is rare for that amount of cold to come before Christmas.

(2) Our threefold repetition of the word "certain" may be thus explained: 1. By the older school of doctors lung disease is sometimes said to exist, where, in truth, it does not. Quite lately a young Englishman was told by a German doctor that his lungs were affected, and was ordered to winter at St. Moritz. Not content with this

on the other hand, there are consumptive patients whom the air seems to have kept alive, and who are, though not well, quite well enough to enjoy life. The list might be swelled with examples of native Engadiners who, having become ill in the plains below, are much better since their return home. It is true that evidence founded on native constitutions is of doubtful application to Englishmen. But, in this inquiry, we must make the most of what evidence we can get; for so few invalids have wintered in the Engadine, that the freezing process should be said, not to have failed there, but never fairly to have been tried. With Davos, of course, the case is different. The experiment has there been tried on such a scale, and for such a time, as, I think, to leave no reasonable doubt that it has, in many instances, been successful. On the whole, the best medical opinion seems to be that the freezing cure promises well where there is tendency to disease rather than actual disease, or where the disease is either dormant or counteracted by a constitution otherwise sound and vigorous; but that the remedy is always a very strong one, and that, both in Scotland and in Switzerland, it has been used too indiscriminately. Hence the general remark with which this article opened applies with the utmost force to consumptive patients; it is sheer madness for these to seek the mountain-cure without the sanction of a physician *who has made the subject his special study*.

From this doleful topic, it is a relief to pass on to a class of invalids, who, without doubt, profit immensely by the Engadine air. I refer to those (overworked students and others) who, though free from organic defects, suffer from cerebral anæmia, and in general from nervous debility. With these, moreover, the experiment of a prolonged stay is a safe one; for, not being liable to be bedridden, they can depart instantly if they feel less well; and, being organically sound, they can rely on such natural indications as their feelings offer. In the infantine phrase, so long as they like the Engadine air, it probably *likes them*. That many will be thus drawn to St. Moritz, may be inferred from the large and increasing number of nervous sufferers who prefer the English winter, with all its drawbacks, and without its field-sports, to the English summer. This preference is mainly restricted to the younger generation, and seems unaccountable to veterans; who fail to perceive that, on this head, opinion, the patient consulted a physician of Brompton Hospital, who discovered that his lungs were perfectly sound. If he had consulted the English doctor *after* wintering in the Engadine, his soundness would have been ascribed to his so wintering, and his case, though really valueless as evidence, would have been held up as conclusive.

2. Some instances, till lately quoted in favour of the winter-cure, have broken down through death or relapse; perhaps, however, the cure in these cases might have been more effectual if it had had a longer trial. 3. An occasional recovery from lung-disease on Alpine heights proves little; for, even in the bad air of London hospitals, such recoveries occur unexpectedly.

the public taste is being modified scarcely less suddenly than, in Pope's day, it became modified in a very different relation ;—

“ Our fathers praised rank venison, you suppose,  
Perhaps, young man, our fathers had no nose.”

We now sometimes credit our forefathers with a no less felicitous inexperience of nerves. Not, of course, that among them functional disorders of the nerves and brain were unknown. But it seems that such disorders are now growing more frequent ; and that they exhibit symptoms novel in their commonness and in their occasional intensity. One of these symptoms of cerebral anæmia is the very modern craving for cold ; which may be said, like Pallas, to have sprung out of the brain, and to have come full-grown into the world. Such a craving is conspicuous in certain invalids who find the English climate, taken as a whole, too relaxing ; they can hold their ground well enough in the English winter and spring, but they tend to become ill in the summer and autumn. These are the persons already mentioned, who, during July and August, are disappointed with St. Moritz ; they are all the time disposed to complain (slightly altering the famous stanza) that 'tis cold of which their nerves are scant ; 'tis cold not heat for which they pant, more cold and keener than they want. Yet, murmur as they may and do, it is to such as these that the Engadine does most permanent good ; for, of all people, they derive most benefit from prolonging and repeating their visits.

Nearly all the invalids at St. Moritz make trial of the iron-waters ; and such is the reputed efficacy of those waters that St. Moritz ranks next to Schwalbach as the chief centre of the Iron-cure. The mineral spring, being what originally brought the place into notice, is even now, in the opinion of German doctors and patients, its principal attraction ; as, indeed, their preference for the damp Kurhaus over the dry village sufficiently testifies. The best English doctors, on the other hand, regard the air-cure as the one thing needful at St. Moritz. But many English patients, as soon as they get abroad, interpret this medical opinion much as an English judge interprets an old-fashioned statute ; the foreign example chimes in only too well with their own natural inclination to try to hasten their recovery by combining all possible cures in the fullest possible measure ; and haply they comfort themselves by imagining that their medical countrymen have called the grapes sour, and have made light of the great mineral waters merely because so few such can conveniently be taken in England. As we deem this tendency to overrate the iron-waters the most widespread and pernicious delusion respecting St. Moritz—a delusion all the more pernicious, that it provokes in some influential persons a reaction against all use of the waters—we propose to consider the question somewhat fully.

St. Moritz owes much of its success to the fact that, in so many cases, it is the same class of patients that are benefited by its air-cure and by its iron-cure. But this advantage is not wholly unalloyed. A belief is sometimes naïvely expressed, and oftener implied, that the two remedies, being here so conveniently together, have a mysterious and providential connection. For, in sooth, is it not clear that they are adapted, nay intended, to be helpmeets to each other, and that it is not good for either remedy to be alone? Nor is this induction based on the single instance of St. Moritz. Just as Malthusians used to be told that, wherever God creates mouths, he also creates hands—so it is sometimes hinted that, wherever Providence places mineral waters, the air is made to suit their medicinal action. This statement, however, so far as it is correct, can be readily explained. Wherever mineral springs exist and are successful, they prove, not by their existence, but by their success, that the surrounding conditions are not opposed to their medicinal use. Iron-springs exist by scores in damp and unsuitable places; but the virtue of such springs is a *celata virtus*; their waters flow indeed, but flow undrunk, and waste their iron on the desert earth. Also, there are many intermediate cases, cases where mineral springs are situated well enough to be used, but not well enough to become celebrated. Now, as St. Moritz has the great merit that its two cures work together for the benefit of many patients, so it has the misfortune that they are thought to work together more completely than they do. The fact is, that a long spell of mountain air profits many who should use the waters (whether as drinkers or as bathers) for a shorter period, and many who should do without them altogether. Of course it is acknowledged in theory that the air-cure and the iron-cure thus admit of being unequally yoked together; no one goes quite so far as to contend that the two remedies which, at St. Moritz, Nature has joined together, man should never put asunder. Still, many invalids, if directed to leave off taking the waters, are strongly biassed in favour of resuming them as quickly as possible, and in the meantime feel as if they were only taking the cure by halves. Indeed, it is a significant fact that the phrase “taking the cure” is nearly always used with special reference to the waters; and that the time which it is the fashion to allot to this very secondary remedy—usually about three weeks, which would seem to be a common dose for diseases at large—often determines the time allotted to that all-important remedy, the air. The evil hence arising may be best shown by an example. Let us put the case of an invalid who ought to take the iron-cure for three weeks, and the air-cure for three months. He will be strongly disinclined to take the one cure without the other; and he will thus be tempted either to take the iron-cure much too long, or to take

the air-cure not nearly long enough. Probably, indeed, he will make a vicious compromise; and, uniting the two remedies for (say) six weeks, he will obtain the full benefit, not of both, but of neither.

In order to set forth more clearly our estimate of the mineral waters, we must call attention to the two opposite opinions current respecting them. One of these opinions (held generally by old ladies, clergymen, and the least skilful foreign doctors) has already been sketched in outline. It is, in effect, that the iron waters of St. Moritz are so prepared in the divine laboratory, as to pass in the best possible way through the human stomach; and that the ingredients of the St. Moritz air are accurately measured out for this progress of the waters, like the powder in a gun for the progress of the bullet. Of course this reasoning is extended to mineral waters in general. It is hinted that, just as the town is inferior to the country, because "God made the country and man made the town," so mineral waters, being the Almighty's medicines, must be more efficacious than mere doctor's medicines; and indeed, that they possess certain magical properties, at once too sacred and too subtle for rational investigation; in short, that such divinity doth hedge a spring, that reason can but peep to what it would.<sup>1</sup> It is fair to add that the early Christians, according to Celsus, regarded hot springs as the tears of the damned; so that the new orthodox view of mysterious springs, if lineally descended from the old orthodox view, has at least improved upon it: for it is less lachrymose, though hardly less unscientific.

Indeed, the extreme opposite of the foregoing view is held by some leading men of science; and a comparison between the two views is instructive as denoting the practical difference between what theologians call design, and what philosophers call function. According to the scientific view, the existence of iron-waters at St. Moritz raises not the smallest presumption that they are so fashioned as to second the remedial action of the St. Moritz air. In fact, the world is not thus patriarchally governed; Providence no more tempers the wind to the shorn lamb than the winter's frost to the

(1) Perhaps the very best comment on the wisdom of attaching any special sanctity or beneficence to natural agents is to be found in the choice of David, who, being asked how his subjects should be punished for the census which he had ordered, resolved to let them have pestilence, *as being a natural agent*, and "to fall into the hand of the Lord, for very great are his mercies" (*ἰσχύρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν Ὀλωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι · Διὸς δὲ τοῖσιν ἐβουλή*). It is curious that, in a case practically similar, a wish, the exact opposite of David's, is put by Virgil into the mouth of the Greek who was flying from the Cyclops: *Si pereō, hominum manibus perire iuvabit*. We have here a good illustration of the contrast between the eastern tendency towards faith in Nature, and the western tendency towards distrust of her. There is a story that a little girl, asking her mother why the cholera was permitted, was told that it was the Almighty's pleasure. Not long after, hearing that the number of deaths had increased, the child remarked quite innocently, "The Almighty seems to have taken his pleasure last week."

dying fly. The composition of the St. Moritz waters must depend on the form and structure of the adjacent rocks, and indirectly on various physical agencies that worked long ago. Is it pretended that the force and direction of these agencies were predetermined by the requirements of nineteenth-century invalids? Yet, in consistency, the optimistic theologian would be bound to hold, not merely this, but also that from generation to generation the waters have changed their properties with every change in the prevalent diseases; nay, that in each case they are transmuted in the glass or stomach, so as to meet the exact wants of the individual patient. And it need hardly be said that to imagine anything approaching to this, would involve a view of final causes, more sentimental indeed, and more attractive, but not a whit more rational, than the view propounded by the Steward (in *King Lear*) when purposing to murder the blinded Gloucester:—

“ That eyeless head of thine was first framed flesh  
To raise my fortunes.”

But (an objector may ask) do not mineral waters, like other natural compounds, contain something which, if they are decomposed, cannot be reproduced by art? Granted. It is likely enough that nature, with the time and all the various appliances at her disposal, can make compounds differing from those which art can make. But is all the advantage on nature's side? At any rate, if her chance compounds are fitter for medical purposes than compounds prepared by medical skill, her superiority does not speak much for the doctors. It is true that natural sea-water is better adapted than artificial sea-water to the health and vigour of sea-fish; whence it is sometimes inferred that natural iron-water must be better adapted than artificial preparations of iron to the health and vigour of men. The analogy, however, would be more to the point if our forefathers and we had always thriven upon, and had become adapted to, iron-waters. In fact, it cannot be too clearly laid down that the world was not “made for man” any more than for fish; but that human, as well as piscine, life has had to fit itself into the world. So that all that can safely be said on the subject is, that, wherever men live and thrive, there the manifold conditions of human vigour are present. But what right have we to include iron-water among those conditions; or to assume *a priori* that such water, being natural, is better suited to human sustenance than (for instance) natural sea-water is? It is only by direct experiment that mineral waters can establish any such medicinal claim; and the results of direct experiment are not always in their favour. In the St. Moritz waters, for example, Nature inserts at least one ingredient (lime) in a quantity, if not in a form, which would be deemed faulty in an ordinary prescription. Now, if she does this sort of thing in the green tree, what will she do in the dry?



If she is found to be a bad doctor in simple matters, which can be easily tested, why should we trust her in those subtler matters (such as her mode of combination) which are imperfectly understood, and to which no accurate tests can be applied? Reasoning in some such way as this, many men of science regard the mineral water mania as, in its origin, theological and optimistic, if not as a survival of nature-worship; and some of them (including the late Sir C. Wheatstone) have gone the length of condemning the drinking of such waters as a mischievous waste of time. We have, indeed, given their view, as well as that of their opponents, in our own words; and, for the sake of clearness and brevity, we have omitted some qualifications which the advocates of the respective systems would probably have introduced.

Between these two extreme views lies the view of some English physicians; and to their opinion the present writer subscribes. It may fairly be said that, in regard to mineral water, the theory of the philosophers is sound, but that in practice the *numero plures, virtute et honore minores* are not entirely mistaken. To the philosophers we may at once concede that mineral water is in no sense a water of life, created for the healing of the people. Nor can much objection be made to their estimate of mineral water, regarded from a purely physical point of view. In this respect, the comparison between nature's random medicines and the skilfully devised medicines of doctors, must turn on three things—the ingredients combined, the proportion in which they are combined, and the mode of combination. So far indeed as this last point is concerned, (assuming that her compounds possess properties which cannot be counterfeited by art) I personally should not deny the existence of a slight presumption that, for medical purposes, her mode of combination may be the best. But, on the score of the ingredients, which she bring together at hap-hazard, and of the proportion in which she combines them, the presumption is certainly against her. That these ingredients and this proportion should happen to be the best even for an individual, is, on the face of it, improbable. That they should happen to be the very best for all the multitudes who frequent the most fashionable mineral springs, is utterly impossible—is, in fact, refuted by the immense variety that distinguishes medical prescriptions, and by the minuteness with which these have to be adjusted to each particular case. Now, in order to make our conclusion clear, we will revert to our comparison with sea-fish. In all probability, sea-fish, removed from their native sea, would fare better if transported into a sea whose salt water differed very slightly from their native salt water, than if placed in artificial salt water made as like their native salt water as possible; in short, they would suffer more from the unfitness of man's mode of

combination than from the slight unfitness in the ingredients which Nature combines. Much in the same way, her mineral waters, when their constituents are very nearly the best possible for an invalid, are likely to do him more good than artificial medicines whose constituents (according to present lights) are absolutely the best for him. It is, however, hard to suppose that, according to the laws of chance, her undesigned prescriptions can, in any appreciable number of cases, be thus nearly the best possible.

It appears then, that, physically regarded, the best mineral waters can only in rare instances compete with the best medicine. But, on the side of the mineral waters, there is a great moral advantage; they are taken, not grudgingly or of necessity, but under divers favourable conditions. At St. Moritz especially, the iron-water, as well as the food, has the moral condiment of which we have spoken: it is abundantly "talked over." Thanks to this aid to digestion, though nature's medicine may not in itself be the very best, yet (in the phrase of Prince Hal) we could have better spared a better one; better a second-rate preparation of iron where sociability is, than a first-rate preparation and silence or sullenness therewith. Also, the iron-water is to be taken only in doses of a glass or half a glass at a time; and, after each of these dribblets of iron, a short walk is to follow. It is important to note that even minute rules of this sort are punctiliously followed; so that a turbid mass of invalids is seen passing to and fro before the Kurhaus with the methodical restlessness of hyænas in a cage. To be sure, this peripatetic regimen does not at first sight look inviting; the little walk recommended to patients with a view to the proper action of the waters, makes one think of the little walk which Socrates was told to take with a view to the proper action of the hemlock. But, in fact, the sanitary promenade—uniting as it does the *spectatum* and the *spectentur ut ipsi* attractions of a morning party—seems to cheer people up; at any rate, the iron-cure thus induces many nervous sufferers to take vastly more air and exercise than they would ever dream of taking without it. This, then, is the grand merit of the St. Moritz waters—they are an excuse for a pleasant walking-class; and thus the mystery about them literally *solvitur ambulando*.

While, however, we own to having no great belief in natural waters as such, we must guard ourselves against one or two common misconceptions. People think they have refuted arguments like the above, by affirming that the iron-water at St. Moritz has indubitably strengthened them. Now (even assuming that this is not a case of reasoning *propter quid post*) their assertion presents no difficulty. For it is a form of the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, it is not the *vis medicatrix ferri*, that we are questioning. The iron-water in these cases has done good; but might not an artificial preparation of iron have done

just as much good? Again, some of the Nature-worshippers triumphantly proclaim that they have been able to digest the iron-waters at St. Moritz, though unable to digest iron medicine at home. Very likely; but may not this superiority on the side of St. Moritz be due less to the extreme digestibility of the St. Moritz waters than to the extreme *digestiveness* of the St. Moritz air? Might not these patients have found it harder to take St. Moritz waters at home than iron medicine at St. Moritz? Indeed, this last experiment has been tried. By one English doctor, patients requiring large doses of iron are sometimes advised to keep a strong form (tincture of perchloride) of iron at the well, and to mix with their glass of iron-water a few drops of the strong form of iron; which few drops contain more iron than whole pints of the water contain. This mixture has the slight physical advantage that the alkali of the waters tends to counteract the acid of the mixture. It has the great moral advantage that, when the strong form of iron touches the weak form, virtue is thought to go out of the weak form, and to spread its magical leaven through the entire compound. Even hypochondriacal sufferers can thus be induced to take the strong form of iron with faith, nothing wavering; and, by walking and talking, to give it the same moral condiment that is usually reserved for the weak form. I am careful to mention this practice, because it has hitherto been seldom adopted, and is not generally known; and also, because I am assured that the ailments of visitors at St. Moritz are very commonly due to the fact that, in order to obtain a sufficiency of iron, they are tempted to take too large a quantity of the cold iron-water—a quantity sometimes amounting to six, or even eight, glasses a day.<sup>1</sup> Before we finally quit the mineral waters and the delusions connected therewith, we must briefly advert to a further mischievous result of those delusions. We have already remarked that the short period commonly assigned to the iron-cure tends, in some cases, to limit the period assigned to the air-cure. But not only does the iron-cure (including the baths) seldom, even in summer, admit of being long continued; it is, in any case, almost immediately cut short by the cold of autumn. Early in September the draughts of cold water become less and less in request, and by the middle of the month the baths

(1) I must not be understood to say that "too much of water" is the portion of all who take large and frequent draughts at the iron-spring. On the contrary, I am informed that one of the most useful services rendered by the iron-waters is, that they give a thorough internal washing to the class of habitual diners-out, who have eaten, and perhaps drunk, too much; but whose favourite beverage has certainly not been water. Probably, indeed, plain water would have done these *bon vivants* quite as much good, or more. But, in all likelihood, they would have objected to performing their internal ablutions in commonplace water, like Naaman to bathing in a commonplace river. One thing, at least, is certain. Patients to whom the iron-waters are recommended, for the sake not so much of the iron as of the water, should be regarded more or less as a class by themselves.

are closed. Now, this is exactly the time when almost everybody departs. The fact plainly is, that people then begin to find that something at St. Moritz does not suit them; and they seldom pause to inquire whether the fault lies both with the air-cure and with the iron-cure, or with the iron-cure only. Indeed, one reason why I have so earnestly combated the semi-theological craze about the iron-cure, is because, but for this *ferri sacra fames*, more nervous sufferers might be induced to try the important experiment of spending a few Septembers and Octobers in the Engadine.

It will perhaps be contended that hardly any Englishmen will ever be so akin to polar bears, as to wish or need, out of even a few years of their lives, to spend a third or a fourth part in the Engadine; and that those who, with the desire, have also the leisure, for such a summerless long vacation, will be still fewer. Yet, in regard to the mere finding of leisure, we have ample evidence that where there is a will there is a way, and that whatsoever a man hath he will give for his health. The crowds that manage to winter abroad in the Riviera and other warm places, are among the many proofs of this. An experienced doctor once told me that he had lately discovered with some surprise, how large is the number of delicate people who, having a sufficient competence to secure absolute leisure, devote that leisure to waiting, so to say, upon health. It is true that these patients (in every sense of the word) are quite as often attracted by heat as by cold. But the physician I speak of had been at St. Moritz; and it was mainly to cold-seekers that his language referred. Indeed, we have many illustrations of the truth, that bracing is becoming more and more the order of the day; and that cold (unlike gold) rises steadily in value. On this head, Davos, with its five hundred winterers, speaks volumes. Another indication, less weighty in itself, but more directly bearing on our present subject, is the fascination exercised over many visitors of the Engadine by the wonderfully keen air on the Bernina pass, which is some 1,500 feet higher than St. Moritz. In 1870, a delicate lady found it worth her while to go almost daily from Pontresina to the top of this pass, a distance of twelve miles, so as to breathe the fine air for a few hours. The Hospice on the pass has been since much improved; and some health-seekers, undaunted by the loneliness and the smell of stables, find that a few weeks spent there, make a pleasant change from the noise and occasional heat of St. Moritz—*ego vel Prochyta præpono Suburra*. Of course this preference is restricted to the physical Irreconcilables, who allow of no compromise with heat. But of this small (though increasing) body, a few have found their stay at Bernina the turning-point after a long illness; and how enthusiastically do they now dwell on its abnormal combination of charms! In fact, they go to Bernina to

have the summer of their discontent made glorious winter; transformed, indeed, into a sort of expurgated edition of the English winter—the English winter without its damp, and the east winds without their pungency; differing also from the English winter in the deep blue of the sky, and in the dazzling and enchanting brilliance of the sunlight. One drawback, however, there is to a long residence on this pass: there are absolutely no trees; unless haply we count as a tree, the dwarf willow (*Saix herbacea*), which rises barely two inches from the ground! So that those only should dream of making a stay, whose zeal for turning August into March is such as to reconcile them to the prayer—

“Pone me, pigris ubi nulla campis  
Arbor æstivâ recreatur aurâ.”

Perhaps, after all, the absence of trees is not an unmixed evil. The superiority of Bernina to Pontresina in point of bracingness is out of all proportion to the difference between the two places in respect of cold. That superiority is, in great part, due to the extreme dryness of the Bernina air; and the dryness must be increased by the scantiness of vegetation. It should, however, be explained that Bernina is by no means—

“A mountain-top  
Where biting cold will never let grass grow.”<sup>1</sup>

Many wild flowers grow there, including some not found at the lower elevation of St. Moritz. Also, the wildness of the scenery is heightened by the Cambrena glacier; and by sundry patches of snow close to the Hospice, which linger on into August. But the most striking features in the landscape are the Black and the White lakes, which are only a few yards apart, and the latter of which owes its colour to glacier water. Possibly even the treelessness, and the rocks fantastically scattered about, help to give the scene a certain weird and unearthly attractiveness, and to make it look as if transported bodily from an Eastern tale or from an allegory. The two lakes especially, so close to each other, yet so marvellous in their contrast, recall the passage where Bunyan describes the mouth of the bottomless pit as hard by the gate of the Celestial City. Fact, however, in this case, improves upon fiction, as the White lake at Bernina is much larger than the Black one.

From the White and Black lakes respectively issue streams flowing into the Adda and the Inn. But the finest watershed in the Engadine is at the Lugni See<sup>2</sup> (not far from Maloja); where, from a single spot, a stone may be cast into the Inn, into a feeder of the

(1) *Henry VI.*, Part II.

(2) Called also “The Frozen Lake.” After the severe winter of 1870–1, it remained frozen until August.

Rhine, or into a feeder of the Po. Some enthusiastic mountaineers call this *the* watershed of Europe; and, in one sense, it deserves the appellation. At St. Gothard, indeed, the watershed is, on the whole, grander; for it contains the sources of the Rhine, the Rhone, the Reuss, and the Ticino. But there is, I believe, no single spot at St. Gothard within a stone's throw of these various sources; so that the Lugni watershed, though otherwise less impressive, has the advantage (one may say) in compactness.

Of the glaciers no minute account will here be attempted; for unfortunately such an account would have to be given at second-hand. The Morteratsch glacier is said to be the easiest to see thoroughly, and also to be the best worth seeing. Carriages can go almost to its base; and non-climbers can form a very fair impression of it from this point and (better still) from the road up to Bernina. The Rosegg glacier is less readily approached through its long valley; and the Roseggthal itself is, in parts at least, not very striking. The mountains do not seem high enough, and the valley is neither narrow enough nor still enough, to come up to one's ideal of Alpine seclusion; and the few struggling trees, suggesting as they do the impotence of Nature, are more destructive either than a luxuriant growth or than complete barrenness, of all sentiment akin to that of the Psalmist who exclaimed, "What is man that thou regardest him?" or, we may add, to that of the romancist who represented Monte Cristo as fascinated by solitude, "*Dans le silence de l'immensité, et sous le regard du Seigneur.*"

No part of the Engadine impresses me nearly so much as the beautiful valley called Beversthal. In it the number of creeping firs is said to be almost unexampled, that of *pinus cembra* is certainly very great. These with their dark foliage heighten the effect produced by this narrow valley, which is enclosed between high walls of steep and rugged mountains. It runs in a crescent round the back of Pitz Ot; and altogether its aspect has a peculiar charm, a charm which a German writer declares to be unparalleled. Nor is it less to the ear than to the eye that this dim, religious valley is impressive. Baedeker notices the pervading silence of the Engadine as *une particularité étonnante*. This remark may have been correct once; now, however, it can hardly be applied to the main valley of the Engadine—certainly not to St. Moritz and Samaden in the season. But it still holds in reference to the side valleys, especially to Beversthal, which is a sort of mountain *cul de sac* wholly without traffic, and which the absolute stillness helps to make solemn and even deathlike. Perchance this eloquent silence may be one reason why certain spots in the Engadine, when revisited from year to year, so frequently and so painfully recall such sentiments as are entertained for an ancestral home which has been

known from childhood, which stirs every feeling of pride and affection, while yet it reposes in majestic dulness, and has the vault where those who have been loved lie buried. Such gloomy reflections gain force when one observes with what wonderful rapidity, in the cold, dry air of the Engadine, the natives, especially the women, wither and shrivel up. One comes to associate the place with human decay, and to think of it as a sort of gorgeous tomb. Not, of course, that such meditations as these are exclusively a growth of the Engadine. They belong more or less to all mountainous regions; insomuch that they make us feel that there is, after all, a real foundation for Buckle's too sweeping assertion about mountain-scenery overawing men, and disposing them to superstition. Assuredly such scenery enervates us with the reminder that the hills stand fast for ever; while we

ὅπποτε πρῶτα θάωμες, ἀνάκοι ἐν χθονὶ κοίλα  
εὐδομες εὖ μάλα μακρὸν ἀτερμονα νήγρετον ὕπνον.

It is obvious to remark that a similar train of reflections may be excited by the ocean. The ocean (as Byron has shown in a famous passage) has the same sort of effect in dwarfing our dignity and humbling our pride that mountains have. But mountains have this influence in a greater degree. For the sea, with its bustling and tumbling, and its changes between calm and storm, has some analogy, and falls into a kind of sympathy, with human emotions. But, in an Alpine range, the steadfast peaks look down, from age to age, on human weakness and wretchedness with something of the brutal indifference of Epicurean gods. Moreover, a narrow and unfrequented valley, such as Beversthal, tends to stunt and paralyse us more than the sea does, because the mountains rob us of our horizon, and appear to cut us off from the world.<sup>1</sup> It may be added that the sea, with its steamboats and breakwaters, has at least a few signs to mark "how grows the day of human power;" whereas desolate heights merely penetrate and oppress us—as sunrise and sunset oppressed Catullus—with the thought that the individual withers and natural forces are ever the same.

The foregoing sentiment tends, as we have said, to arise in all mountainous districts; or, at any rate, in all those districts, rare in civilised countries, where the natural features are so strongly marked, and where man has added so little, that an ancient inhabitant, if he could now rise from the dead, would recognise his home certainly

(1) The sentiment of isolation springs up in Alpine gorges very commonly. But it affects people in different ways. It has been said of secluded valleys that "elles ont ceci de charmant, qu'on peut croire que c'est la fin du monde, que par delà il en existe un autre bien différent de celui que nous voyons, un monde où règne une divine harmonie, où toutes les femmes sont fidèles, où toute question obtient sa réponse et tout dévouement sa récompense, où les biens sont assurés, où les bonheurs sont éternels."

and at once. But, in the lonely parts of the Engadine, the sentiment is exceptionally strong. A traveller, spending several weeks at the Riffel, has time to get his feelings into harmony with the solitude, and to become, as it were, part of the scene. But, in the neighbourhood of St. Moritz, such gleams of solitude as there are shine brighter through the contrast. After "communing with the universe" on the Fex glacier, the tourist returns at nightfall to the Kulm Hotel, where not unfrequently a ball (with various civilised appendages, such as invitation cards for outsiders) is given by the Italians and English, where once in the season there is a cotillon duly besprinkled with princes and princesses, and lasting till two in the morning, and where last year a newly-arrived lady asked quite seriously the scarcely surprising and possibly prophetic question: "N'est-ce pas qu'il y a un théâtre ici?" To some persons who make a long annual stay in the Engadine, and who object to being bored, a contrast of this sort has its pleasant side; they are not sorry that their summer home should have a time for every work under the sun, including even "a time to dance." But to the genuine lover of mountains, these dancing tourists are so many trespassers on his preserve; he looks upon St. Moritz as a sort of Ramsgate on the Alps, and hates it with perfect hatred. The fact is, that, through the Engadine being a favourite resort of over-worked students, a large proportion of the visitors consists of cultivated persons; and, as the autumn advances, the cockney element almost wholly disappears. But it is with the Engadine itself, as well as with its visitors, that the climbers are at war. Mr. Freshfield goes so far as to describe the Engadine rather enigmatically as bleak uplands "where a shallow uniform trench does duty for the valley which has never yet been dug out, and where the minor and most conspicuous peaks have a mean and ruinous aspect." So harsh a criticism is, we confess, to us incomprehensible; though, no doubt, when we gaze on the huge and hideous Kurhaus, and on the long and most incongruous street of bran new *pensions*, which already crosses the river, and will soon stretch for nearly a mile (from the Kurhaus to the village), we often think how different the stream and lakes would look *viridi si gramine cluderet undas herba*, and if giant hotels (to say nothing of the projected railroad) did not violate the native rock.<sup>1</sup> But, at any rate, the hotels and *pensions* cannot "violate" the summits of the hills around; so that, at the worst, the immediate neighbourhood of St. Moritz will become—what both Ireland and Cheshire have been called—an ugly picture in a beautiful frame.

Another fault sometimes found with the Engadine is that the valley might be in any mountainous country; it lacks some of the characteristic features of Swiss scenery. There are many places out

(1) See Juvenal, III. 19, 20.



of Switzerland to which it is compared. It is said closely to resemble Nynetel in India; and it has been likened to various places in Norway, in Scotland, and in Wales. To me individually, the drive from St. Moritz to Sils and to the Maloja—with the chain of lakes on the left hand, which sometimes wear the aspect of a wide river—most forcibly recalls the ten miles, said to be the most beautiful in North Wales, between Dolgelly and Barmouth. Those who have never seen the Engadine, will deem the comparison of Wales with it extravagant; but, in truth, though Pitz Languard is more than triple the height of Cader Idris, yet, when it is seen from the high Engadine valley, and through the clear Engadine air which makes mountains seem nearer but smaller, and also when the eye has been trained to judge by the Swiss standard of magnitude, the Swiss mountain does not appear much larger than the Welsh. Hence it arises that by mountaineers who have become *blasés* for all mountain views short of the grandest, as well as by some busy men whose holidays are short, and who need a total change, the scenery of the Engadine is thought tame and unattractive. But, for persons obliged to spend a large proportion of their lives in it, the valley derives an additional charm from its comparative homeliness and its manifold associations; it calls up old times, and gives a picture—though a magnified and idealized picture—of familiar scenes. Possibly there is a certain attraction even in that “hardness” of the Engadine scenery which is the bugbear of artists, who seem to say of mountain views—as Principal Tulloch says of religious opinions—that they should be somewhat *hazy*. Still, this clearness or hardness helps one, as it were, to keep hold of the entire scene; the outline of the mountains, if too sharp for painters, yet by reason of its sharpness sticks in the memory.

At all events, for the Engadiners themselves, the charm of the valley is irresistible. Their intense love of home may serve to explain a peculiarity which has often been noticed. When one considers their land and climate, one fancies that nature has done her very best to keep the inhabitants in penury. Yet, on entering their houses, one almost always observes signs of easy circumstances, sometimes even of affluence. In fact, it may almost be said that, of Alpine valleys, the Engadine is at once the poorest and the richest. No doubt, this general well-being is partly a result, because a condition, of a successful struggle with nature; those only can live and bring up families in the cold climate who can afford the comfort which the cold climate requires. Something, also, is probably due to the stringent rule which existed till within the last few years, restraining from marriage persons who had not means for the support of a family. But a similar regulation is said to have prevailed in other parts of Switzerland, and therefore does not account

for the pre-eminent prosperity of the Engadine. That prosperity is commonly ascribed to the fortunes which the Engadiners throughout Europe have made as pastrycooks. The strange thing, however, is, that these fortunes, having been made out of the Engadine, should ever find their way into it. Of the wealth acquired by Irishmen in America, only a small part is brought to Ireland; and even patriotic coolies enrich their native land, not with their money, but with their bones. But the emigrant Engadiners are still of the Engadine, and unto the Engadine they return; and the only reason they give for their so returning is that, from their beloved mountains, they cannot permanently keep away. They come back to the heights from which they went forth—bound, so to say, by a mechanical law, like that which raises water to its own level. Natives of the Engadine and of the adjacent valleys use touching language on this subject. Not long ago, at Tiefenkasten, attention was drawn to two sisters by reason of the marked difference between them in point of education. It was found that both had been to school at Munich, but that there the elder of them became ill and melancholy. The doctor pronounced the illness to be *Heimweh*—a recognised and not uncommon malady of the Swiss. The poor girl grew worse and worse, and drooped as if disappointed in love; till, at last, she was told to go home, and to save her life at the expense of her education. It is probable that her case was an extreme one. But of all the Engadiners, even of those who succeed best abroad, it may be said that, like the fallen angels, they count themselves strangers in the low country, and that their one hope is in after years

“To reascend  
Self-raised, and repossess their native seat.”

Hence, by comparison, it may be judged how strong a fascination this delightful valley exercises over the delicate people whom it exactly suits, particularly over those who can enjoy tolerable health by spending season after season in it, and who can enjoy such health in no other way. Some of these—such, especially, as have not had too much of a good thing by being obliged to spend entire winters in the Engadine—look upon it as their favourite home, and can say in regard to it: *Ubi bene, ibi patria*.

LIONEL A. TOLLEMACHE.

## M. TAINÉ'S NEW WORK.<sup>1</sup>

THE announcement that one of the most ingenious and accomplished men of letters in Europe was engaged upon a history of the French Revolution raised some doubts among those who have thought most about the qualifications proper to the historian. M. Taine has the quality of the best type of a man of letters; he has the fine critical aptitude for seizing the secret of an author's or an artist's manner, for penetrating to dominant and central ideas, for marking the abstract and general under accidental forms in which they are concealed, for connecting the achievements of literature and art with facts of society and impulses of human character and life. He is the master of a style, which if it seems to lack the breadth, the firmness, the sustained and level strength of great writing, is yet always energetic, and fresh, and alive with that spontaneous reality and independence of interest which distinguishes the genuine writer from the mere weaver of sentences and servile mechanic of the pen. The matter and form alike of M. Taine's best work—and we say best, for his work is by no means without degrees and inequalities of worth—prove that he has not shrunk from the toil and austerity of the student, from that scorn of delight and living of laborious days, by which only can men either get command of the art of just and finished expression, or gather much knowledge.

But with all its attractiveness and high uses of its own, the genius for literature in its proper sense is distinct from the genius for political history. The discipline is different, because the matter is different. To criticise Rousseau's Social Contract requires one set of attainments, and to judge the proceedings of the Constituent Assembly or the Convention requires a set of quite different attainments. A man may have the keenest sense of the filiation of ideas, of their scope and purport, and yet have a very dull or uninterested eye for the play of material forces, the wayward tides of great gatherings of men, the rude and awkward methods that sometimes go to the attainment of wise political ends.

It would perhaps not be too bold to lay down this proposition: that no good social history has ever been written by a man who has not either himself taken a more or less active part in public affairs, or else been an habitual intimate of persons who were taking such a part on a considerable scale. Everybody knows what Gibbon said about the advantage to the historian of the Roman Empire of having been a

(1) *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine*. Tom. i. *L'Ancien Régime*. Par M. Taine. Paris: Hachette. 1876.

member of the English parliament and a captain in the Hampshire grenadiers. Thucydides commanded an Athenian squadron, and Tacitus filled the offices of prætor and consul. Guicciardini was an ambassador, a ruler, and the counsellor of rulers, and Machiavel was all these things and more. Voltaire was the keen-eyed friend of the greatest princes and statesmen of his time, and was more than once engaged in diplomatic transactions. Robertson was a powerful party chief in the Assembly of the Scotch Church. Grote and Macaulay were active members of parliament, and Hallam and Milman were confidential members of circles where affairs of state were the staple of daily discussion among the men who were responsible for conducting them to successful issues. Guizot was a *primo minister*, Finlay was a farmer of the Greek revenue. The most learned of contemporary English historians a few years ago contested a county, and is habitually inspired in his researches into the past by his interest in the politics of the present. The German historians, whose gifts in reconstructing the past are so valuable and so singular, have for the most part been as actively interested in the public movements of to-day as in those of any century before or since the Christian era. Niebuhr held more than one political post of dignity and importance; and of historical writers in our time, one has sat in several Prussian parliaments; another, once the tutor of a Prussian prince, has lived in the atmosphere of high politics; while all the best of them have taken their share in the preparation of the political spirit and ideas that have restored Germany to all the fulness and exaltation of national life. It is hardly necessary to extend the list. It is indeed plain on the least reflection that close contact with political business, however modest in its pretensions, is the best possible element in the training of any one who aspires to understand and reproduce political history. Political preparation is as necessary as literary preparation. There is no necessity that the business should be on any majestic and imperial scale. To be a guardian of the poor in an East-End parish, to be behind the scenes of some great strike of labour, to be an active member of the parliamentary committee of a Trades Council or of the executive committee of a Union or a League, may be quite as instructive discipline as participation in mightier scenes. Those who write concrete history, without ever having taken part in practical politics, are, one might say, in the position of those ancients who wrote about the human body without ever having effectively explored it by dissection. Mr. Carlyle, it is true, by force of penetrating imaginative genius, has reproduced in stirring and resplendent dithyrambs the fire and passion, the rags and tears, the many-tinted dawn and the blood-red sunset of the French Revolution; and the more a man learns about the details of the Revolution, the greater is his admiration for Mr. Carlyle's magnificent performance. But it is dramatic

presentation, not social-analysis; a masterpiece of literature, not a scientific investigation; a prodigy of poetic insight, not a sane and quantitative exploration of the complex processes, the deep-lying economical, fiscal, and political conditions, that prepared so immense an explosion.

We have to remember, it is true, that M. Taine is not professing to write a history in the ordinary sense. His book lies, if we may use two very pompous but indispensable words, partly in the region of historiography, but much more in the region of sociology. The study of the French Revolution cannot yet be a history of the past, for the French still walk *per ignes suppositos*, and the Revolution is still some way from being fully accomplished. It was the disputes between the Roman and the Reformed churches which inspired historical research in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and it is the disputes among French parties that now inspire what professes to be historiography, but what is really a sort of experimental investigation in the science of society. They little know how long and weary a journey lies before them, said Burke, who undertake to bring great masses of men into the political unity of a nation. The process is still going on, and a man of M. Taine's lively intellectual sensibility can no more escape its influences, than he can escape the ingredients of the air he breathes. We may add that if his work had been really historic, he must inevitably have gone further back than the eighteenth century for the 'Origins' of contemporary France. The very slight, vague, and unsubstantial chapter with which he opens his work, cannot be accepted as a substitute for what the subject really demanded—a serious summary, however condensed and rapid, of the various forces, accidents, deliberate lines of policy, which from the breaking up of the great fiefs down to the death of Lewis the Fourteenth, had prepared the distractions of the monarchy under Lewis's descendants.

Full of interest as it is, M. Taine's book can hardly be described as containing much that is new or strikingly significant. He develops one idea, indeed, which we have never before seen stated in its present form, but which if it implies more than has been often advanced by previous writers in other forms, cannot be accepted as true. This is perhaps a point better worth discussing than any other which his book raises. The rest is a very elaborate and thorough description of the structure of society, of its physiognomy in manners and characteristics, the privileges, the burdens, the daily walk and conversation of the various classes which made up the French people between the Regency and the Revolution. M. Taine's method of description does not strike one as altogether happy. It is a common complaint against French historians that they are too lax about their authorities, and too heedless about giving us chapter and verse for

their assertions. M. Taine goes to the contrary extreme, and pours his note-books into his text, with a steady-handed profusion that is excessively fatiguing, and makes the result far less effective than it would have been if all this industrious reading had been thoroughly fused and recast into a homogeneous whole. It is an ungenerous trick of criticism to disparage good work by comparing it with better; but the reader can scarcely help contrasting M. Taine's overcrowded pages with the perfect assimilation, the pithy fulness, the pregnant meditation of De Tocqueville's book on the same subject. When we attempt to reduce M. Taine's chapters to a body of propositions standing out in definite relief from one another, yet conveying a certain unity of interpretation, we soon feel how possible it is for an author to have literary clearness along with historic obscurity.

In another respect we are inclined to question the felicity of M. Taine's method. It does not convey the impression of movement. The steps and changes in the conflict among the organs of the old society are not marked in their order and succession. The reader is not kept alive to the gradual progress of the break-up of old institutions and ideas. The sense of an active and ceaseless struggle, extending in various stages across the century, is effaced by an exclusive attention to the social details of a given phase. We need the story. You cannot effectively reproduce the true sense and significance of such an epoch as the eighteenth century in France, without telling us, however barely, the tale, for example, of the long battle of the ecclesiastical factions, and the yet more important series of battles between the judiciary and the crown. If M. Taine's book were a piece of abstract social analysis, the above remark would not be true. But it is a study of the concrete facts of French life and society, and to make such a study effective, the element of the chronicle, as in Lacretelle or Jobez, cannot rightly be dispensed with.

Let us proceed to the chief thesis of the book. The new formula in which M. Taine describes the source of all the mischiefs of the revolutionary doctrine is this. "When we see a man," he says, "who is rather weak in constitution, but apparently sound and of peaceful habits, drink eagerly of a new liquor, then suddenly fall to the ground, foaming at the mouth, delirious and convulsed, we have no hesitation in supposing that in the pleasant draught there was some dangerous ingredient; but we need a delicate analysis in order to decompose and isolate the poison. There is one in the philosophy of the eighteenth century, as curious as it was potent: for not only is it the product of a long historic elaboration, the final and condensed extract in which the whole thought of the century ends; but more than that, its two principal elements are peculiar in this,

that when separated they are each of them salutary, yet in combination they produce a poisonous compound." These two ingredients are first, the great and important acquisitions of the eighteenth century in the domain of physical science; second, the fixed classic form of the French intelligence. "It is the classic spirit which, being applied to the scientific acquisitions of the time, produced the philosophy of the century and the doctrines of the Revolution." This classic spirit has in its literary form one or two well known marks. It leads, for instance, to the fastidious exclusion of particulars, whether in phrases, objects, or traits of character, and substitutes for them the general, the vague, the typic. Systematic arrangement orders the whole structure and composition from the period to the paragraph, from the paragraph to the structural series of paragraphs; it dictates the style as it has fixed the syntax. Its great note is the absolute. Again, "two principal operations make up the work of the human intelligence: placed in face of things, it receives the impression of them more or less exactly, completely, and profoundly; next, leaving the things, it decomposes its impression, and classifies, distributes, and expresses more or less skilfully the ideas that it draws from that impression. In the second of these processes the classic is superior." Classicism is only the organ of a certain reason, the *raison raisonnante*; that which insists upon thinking with as little preparation and as much ease as possible; which is contented with what it has acquired, and takes no thought about augmenting or renewing it; which either cannot or will not embrace the plenitude and the complexity of things as they are.

As an analysis of the classic spirit in French literature, nothing can be more ingenious and happy than these pages (p. 241, etc.). But, after all, classic is only the literary form preferred by a certain turn of intelligence; and we shall do well to call that turn of intelligence by a general name that shall comprehend not only its literary form but its operations in every other field. And accordingly at the end of this very chapter we find M. Taine driven straightway to change classic for mathematic in describing the method of the new learning. And the latter description is much better, for it goes beneath the surface of literary expression, important as that is, down to the methods of reasoning. It leads us to the root of the matter, to the deductive habits of the French thinkers. The mischief of the later speculation of the eighteenth century in France was that men argued about the complex, conditional, and relative propositions of society, as if they had been theorems and problems of Euclid. And M. Taine himself is, as we say, compelled to change his term when he comes to the actual facts and personages of the revolutionary epoch. It was the geometric, rather than the classic, quality of

political reasoning, which introduced so much that we now know to have been untrue and mischievous.

Even in literary history it is surely nearer the truth to say of the latter half of the century that the revolutionary movement began with the break-up of classic form and the gradual dissolution of the classic spirit. Indeed this is such a commonplace of criticism, that we can only treat M. Taine's inversion of it as a not very happy paradox. It was in literature that this genius of innovation which afterwards extended over the whole social structure, showed itself first of all. Rousseau, not merely in the judgment of a foreigner like myself, but in that of the very highest of all native authorities, Sainte Beuve, effected the greatest revolution that the French tongue had undergone since Pascal. And this revolution was more remarkable for nothing than for its repudiation of nearly all the notes of classicism that are enumerated by M. Taine. Diderot again in every page of his work, whether he is discussing painting, manners, science, the drama, poetry, or philosophy, abounds and overabounds in those details, particularities, and special marks of the individual, which are, as M. Taine rightly says, alien to the classic genius. Both Rousseau and Diderot, considered as men of letters, were conscious literary revolutionists before they were used as half-conscious social revolutionists. They deliberately put away from them the entire classic tradition as to the dignity of personage proper to art, and the symmetry and fixed method proper to artistic style. This was why Voltaire, who was a son of the seventeenth century before he was the patriarchal sire of the eighteenth, could never thoroughly understand the author of the *New Hcloisa* or the author of the *Père de Famille* and Jacques le Fataliste. Such work was to him for the most part a detestable compound of vulgarity and rodomontade. "There is nothing living in the eighteenth century," M. Taine says, "but the little sketches that are stitched in by the way and as if they were contraband, by Voltaire, and five or six portraits like Turcaret, Gil Blas, Marianne, Manon Lescaut, Rameau's Nephew, Figaro, two or three hasty sketches of Crebillon the younger and Collé" (p. 258). Nothing living but this! But this is much and very much. We do not pretend to compare the authors of these admirable delineations with Molière and La Bruyère in profundity of insight or in grasp and ethical mastery, but they are certainly altogether in a new vein even from those two great writers, when we speak of the familiar, the real, and the particular, as distinguished from old classic generality. And, we may add in passing, that the social life of France from the death of Lewis XIV. downwards was emancipated all round from the formality and precision of the classic time. As M. Taine himself shows in many amusing pages, life was singularly gay, free, sociable, and varied. The literature of the time was sure to reflect, and does



reflect, this universal rejection of the restraints of the age when the classic spirit had been supreme.

Apart from this kind of objection to its exact expression, let us look at the substance of M. Taine's dictum. "It was the classic spirit, which, when applied to the scientific acquisitions of the time, produced the philosophy of the century and the doctrines of the Revolution." Even if we substitute geometric or deductive spirit for classic spirit, the proposition remains nearly as unsatisfactory. What were the doctrines of the revolution? The sovereignty of the people, rights of man, liberty, equality, fraternity, progress and perfectibility of the species—these were the main articles of the new creed. M. Taine, like too many French writers, writes as if these ideas had never been heard of before '89. Yet the most important and decisive of them were at least as old as the Reformation, were not peculiarly French in any sense, and were no more the special products of the classic spirit mixing with scientific acquisitions, than they were the products of Manicheanism. It is extraordinary that a writer who attributes so much importance to Rousseau, and who gives us so ample an account of his political ideas, should not have traced these ideas to their source, nor even told us that they had a source wholly outside of France. Rousseau was a protestant; he was a native of the very capital and mother city of protestantism militant and democratic; and he was penetrated to his heart's core by the political ideas which had arisen in Europe at the Reformation. There is not a single principle in the Social Contract which may not be found either in Hobbes, or in Locke, or in Althusen, any more than there is a single proposition of his deism which was not in the air of Geneva when he wrote his *Savoyard Vicar*. If this be the case, what becomes of the position that the revolutionary philosophy was worked out by the *raison raisonnée* which is the special faculty of a country saturated with the classic spirit? If we must have a formula, it would be nearer the truth to say that the doctrines of the Revolution were the product, not of the classic spirit applied to scientific acquisitions, but first of the democratic ideas of the protestant reformation, and then of the fictions of the lawyers, both of them allied with certain urgent social and political necessities.

So much, then, for the political side of the 'philosophy of the century,' if we are to use this too comprehensive expression for all the products of a very complex and manysided outburst of speculative energy. Apart from its political side, we find M. Taine's formula no less unsatisfactory for its other phases. He seems to us not to go back nearly far enough in his search for the intellectual origins, any more than for the political origins, of his contemporary France. He has taken no account of the progress of the spirit of Scepticism from Montaigne's time, nor of the decisive influence of

Montaigne on the revolutionary thinkers. Yet the extraordinary excitement aroused in France by Bayle's Dictionary was a proof of the extent to which the sceptical spirit had spread before the Encyclopædists were born. The great influence of Fontenelle was wholly in the same sceptical direction. There was a strong sceptical element in French Materialism, even when materialism was fully developed and seemed most dogmatic.<sup>1</sup> Indeed it may sometimes occur to the student of such a man as Diderot, to wonder how far materialism in France was only seized upon as a means of making scepticism both serious and philosophic. For its turn for scepticism is at least as much a distinction of the French intelligence as its turn for classicism. And, once more, if we must have a formula, it would be best to say that the philosophy of the century was the product first of scepticism applied to old beliefs which were no longer easily tenable, and then of scepticism extended to old institutions that were no longer practically habitable.

And this brings us to the cardinal reason for demurring to M. Taine's neatly rounded proposition. His appreciation of the speculative precursors of the Revolution seems to us to miss the decisive truth about them. He falls precisely into those errors of the *raison raisonnante* about which in his description of the intellectual preparation of the great overthrow, he has said so many just and acute things. Nothing can be more really admirable than M. Taine's criticism upon Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, as great masters of language (pp. 339-361). All this is marked by an amplitude of handling, a variety of approach, a subtlety of perception, a fulness of comprehension, which give a very different notion of M. Taine's critical soundness and power from any that one could have got from his account elsewhere of our English writers. Some of the remarks are open to criticism, as might be expected. It is hard to accept the saying (p. 278) that Montesquieu's "celebrity was not an influence." It was Montesquieu, after all, who first introduced among the Encyclopædic band a rationalistic and experiential conception of the various legal and other conditions of the social union, as distinguished from the old theological explanation of them. The correspondence of Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, D'Alembert, is sufficient to show how immediately, as well as how powerfully, they were influenced by Montesquieu's memorable book. Again, it is surely going too far to say that Montesquieu's Persian Letters contained every important idea of the century. Does it, for instance, contain that thrice fruitful idea which Turgot developed in 1750, of all the ages being linked together by an ordered succession of causes and effects? These and other objections, however, hardly affect the brilliance and substantial excellence of all this part of the

(1) See Lange's *Gesch. d. Materialismus*, i. 298.

book. It is when he proceeds to estimate these great men, not as writers but as social forces, not as stylists but as apostles, that M. Taine discloses the characteristic weaknesses of the book-man in dealing with the facts of concrete sociology. He shows none of this weakness in what he says of the remote past. On the contrary he blames, as we have all blamed, Voltaire, Rousseau, and the rest of the group, for their failure to recognise that the founders of religions satisfied a profound need in those who accepted them, and that this acceptance was the spontaneous admission of its relative fitness. It would be impossible to state this important truth better than M. Taine has done in the following passage:—

"At certain critical moments in history," he says, "men have come out from the narrow and confined track of their daily life, and seized in one wide vision the infinite universe; the august face of eternal nature is suddenly unveiled before them; in the sublimity of their emotion they seem to perceive the very principle of its being; and at least they did discern some of its features. By an admirable stroke of circumstance, these features were precisely the only ones that their age, their race, a group of races, a fraction of humanity, happened to be in a condition to understand. Their point of view was the only one under which the multitudes beneath could place themselves. For millions of men, for hundreds of generations, the only access to divine things was along their path. They pronounced the unique word, heroic or tender, enthusiastic or tranquillising; the only word that around them and after them, the heart and the intelligence would consent to hearken to; the only one adapted to the deep-growing wants, the long-gathered aspirations, the hereditary faculties, a whole moral and mental structure,—here to that of the Hindu or the Mongol, there to that of the Semite or the European, in our Europe to that of the German, the Latin, or the Slav; in such a way that its contradictions, instead of condemning it, were exactly what justified it, since its diversity produced its adaptation, and its adaptation produced its benefits." (p. 272.)

It is extraordinary that a thinker who could so clearly discern the secret of the great spiritual movements of human history, should fail to perceive that the same law governs and explains all the minor movements in which wide communities have been suddenly agitated by the word of a teacher. It is well—as no one would be more likely to contend than myself, who have attempted the task—to demonstrate the contradictions, the superficiality, the inadequateness, of the teaching of Rousseau, Voltaire, or Diderot; but it is well also, and in a historical student it is not only well, but the very pith and marrow of criticism, to search for that 'adaptation,' to use M. Taine's very proper expression, which gave to the word of these teachers its mighty power and far-spreading acceptance. Is

it not as true of Rousseau and Voltaire, acting in a small society, as it is of Buddha or Mahomet acting on vast groups of races, that "*leur point de vue était le seul auquel les multitudes échelonnées au dessous d'eux pouvaient se mettre*"? Did not they too seize, "by a happy stroke of circumstance," exactly those traits in the social union, in the resources of human nature, in its deep-seated aspirations, which their generation was in a condition to comprehend,—liberty, equality, fraternity, progress, justice, tolerance?

M. Taine shows, as so many others have shown before him, that the Social Contract, when held up in the light of true political science, is very poor stuff. Undoubtedly it is so. And Quintilian—an accomplished and ingenious Taine of the first century—would have thought the Gospels, and Epistles, and Augustine and Jerome and Chrysostom, very poor stuff, compared with the—

"Mellifluous streams that watered all the schools  
Of Academics old and new, with those  
Surnamed Peripatetics, and the Sect  
Epicurean, and the Stoic severe."

And in some ways, from a literary or logical point of view, the early Christian writers could ill bear this comparison. But great bodies of men, in ages of trouble and confusion, have an instinctive feeling for the fragment of truth which they happen to need at the hour. They have a spontaneous apprehension of the formula which is at once the expression of their miseries and the mirror of their hope. The guiding force in the great changes of the world has not been the formal logic of the schools or of literature, but the practical logic of social convenience. Men take as much of a teacher's doctrine as meets their real wants: the rest they leave. The Jacobins accepted Rousseau's ideas about the sovereignty of the people, but they seasonably forgot his glorification of the state of nature and his denunciations of civilisation and progress. The American revolutionists cheerfully borrowed the doctrine that all men are born free and equal, but they kept their slaves.

It was for no lack of competition that the ideas of the Social Contract, of Raynal's History of the two Indies, of the System of Nature, of the Philosophical Dictionary, made such astounding and triumphant way in men's minds. There was Montesquieu with a sort of historic method. There was Turgot, and the school of the economists. There were seventy thousand of the secular clergy, and sixty thousand of the regular clergy, ever proclaiming by life or exhortation ideas of peace, submission, and a kingdom not of this world. Why did men turn their backs on these and all else, and betake themselves to revolutionary ideas? How came these ideas to rise up and fill the whole air? The answer is that, with all their contradiction, shallowness, and danger, these ideas fitted the crisis.

They were seized by virtue of an instinct of national self-preservation. The evil elements in them worked themselves out in infinite mischief. The true elements in them saved France, by firing men with social hope and patriotic faith.

How was it, M. Taine rightly asks, that the philosophy of the eighteenth century which was born in England and thence sent its shoots to France, dried up in the one country, and grew to overshadow the earth in the other? Because, he answers, the new seed fell upon ground that was suited to it, the home of the classic spirit, the country of *raison raisonnée*. Compare with this merely literary solution, the answer given to the same question by De Tocqueville:—"It was no accident that the philosophers of the 18th century generally conceived notions so opposed to those which still served as the base of the society of their time; *these ideas had actually been suggested to them by the very sight of that society, which they had ever before their eyes.*" (*Ancien Régime*, 206.) This is the exact truth and the whole truth. The greatest enterprise achieved by the men of letters in the period of intellectual preparation was the Encyclopædia; and not many months ago I tried to present in these pages what seemed to be ample evidence that the spirit and aim of that great undertaking were social, and that its conductors, while delivering their testimony in favour of the experiential conception of life in all its aspects, and while reproducing triumphantly the most recent acquisitions of science, had still the keenest and most direct eye for the abuses and injustice, the waste and disorder, of the social institutions around them. The answer, then, which we should venture to give to M. Taine's question would be much simpler than his. The philosophy of the eighteenth century fared differently in England and in France, because its ideas did not fit in with the economic and political conditions of the one, while on the contrary they were actively warmed and fostered by those of the other. It was not a literary aptitude in the nation for *raison raisonnée* which developed the political theories of Rousseau, the moral and psychological theories of Diderot, the anti-ecclesiastical theories of Voltaire and Holbach. It was the profound disorganization of institutions that suggested and stimulated the speculative agitation. "The nation," wrote the wise and far-seeing Turgot, "has no constitution; it is a society composed of different orders ill assorted, and of a people whose members have few social bonds with one another; where consequently scarcely any one is occupied with anything beyond his private interest exclusively," and so forth. (*Œuv.* ii. 504.) Any student, uncommitted to a theory, who examines in close detail the wise aims and just and conservative methods of Turgot, and the circumstances of his utter rout after a short experiment of twenty months of power, will rise from that deplorable episode with the conviction that a

pacific renovation of France, an orderly readjustment of her institutions, was hopelessly impossible. '*Si on avait été sage !*' those cry who consider the revolution as a futile mutiny. If people had only been prudent, all would have been accomplished that has been accomplished since, and without the sanguinary memories, the constant interpolations of despotism, the waste of generous lives and noble purpose. And this is true. But then prudence itself was impossible. The court and the courtiers were smitten through the working of long tradition by judicial blindness. If Lewis XVI. had been a Frederick, or Marie Antoinette had been a Catherine of Russia, or the nobles had even been stout-hearted gentlemen like our cavaliers, the great transformation might then have been gradually effected without disorder. But they were none of these, and it was their characters that made the fate and doom of the situation. As for the court, Vergennes used an expression which suggests the very keyword of the situation. He had been ambassador in Turkey, and was fond of declaring that he had learnt in the seraglio how to brave the storms of Versailles. Versailles was like Stamboul or Teheran, oriental in etiquette, oriental in destruction of wealth and capital, oriental in antipathy to a reforming grand vizier. It was the Queen, as we now know by incontestable evidence, who persuaded the king to dismiss Turgot, merely to satisfy some contemptible personal resentments of herself and her creatures.<sup>1</sup> And it was not in Turgot's case only that this ineptitude wrought mischief. In June, 1789, Necker was overruled in the wisest elements of his policy, and sent into exile, by the violent intervention of the same court faction, headed by the same Queen, who had procured the dismissal of Turgot thirteen years earlier. And it was one long tale throughout, from the first hour of the reign down to those last hours at the Tuileries in August, 1792; one long tale of intrigue, perversity, and wilful incorrigible infatuation.

Nor was the Queen only to blame. Turgot, says an impartial eyewitness—Creutz the Swedish ambassador—is a mark for the most formidable league possible, composed of all the great people in the kingdom, all the parliaments, all the finance, all the women of the court, and all the pious. It was morally impossible that the reforms of any Turgot could have been acquiesced in by that emasculated caste, who showed their quality a few years after his dismissal by flying across the frontier at the first breath of personal danger. "When the gentlemen rejoiced so boisterously over the fall of Turgot, their applause was blind; on that day they threw away, and in a manner that was irreparable, the opportunity that was offered them of being born again to political life, and changing the state-candlestick of the royal household for the influence of a pre-

(1) *Corresp. entre Marie Thérèse et le Comte Mercy-Argenteau*, vol. iii.

ponderant class. The nobility, defeated on the field of feudal privilege, would have risen again by the influence of an assembly where they would have taken the foremost place; by defending the interests of all, by becoming in their turn the ally of the third estate, which had hitherto fought on the side of the kings, they would have repaired the unbroken succession of defeats that had been inflicted on them since Lewis the Fat."<sup>1</sup> It would be easy to name half a dozen patricians like the Duke d'Ayen, of exceptional public spirit and capacity, but a proud order cannot at the first exigency of a crisis change its traditional front, and abandon the maxims of centuries in a day. As has been said more than once, the oriental policy of the crown towards the nobles had the inevitable effect of cutting them off from all opportunity of acquiring in experience those habits of political wisdom which have saved the territorial aristocracy of our own country. The English nobles in the eighteenth century had become, what they mostly are now, men of business; agriculturists at least as much as politicians; land-agents of a very dignified kind, with very large incomes. Sully designed to raise a working agricultural aristocracy, and Colbert to raise a working commercial aristocracy. But the statesman cannot create or mould a social order at will. Perhaps one reason why the English aristocracy became a truly agricultural body in the eighteenth century, was the circumstance that many of the great landowning magnates were Tories and remained sulking on their estates rather than go to the court of the first two kings of the Hanoverian line; just as the dependence of these two sovereigns of revolutionary title upon the revolution families is one reason why English liberties had time to root themselves thoroughly before the monarchical reaction under George III. In France, for reasons which we have no space to expatiate upon, the experiments both of Sully and of Colbert failed. The result may be read with graphic effect in the pages of Arthur Young, both before the revolution broke out, and again after Burke's superb rhetoric had biassed English opinion against it.

M. Léonce de Lavergne, it is true, in his most interesting book upon the Provincial Assemblies under Lewis XVI., has endeavoured to show that in the great work of administrative reform all classes between 1778 and 1787 had shown themselves full of a liberal and practical spirit. But even in his pages we see enough of apprehensions and dissensions to perceive how deep was the intestine disorganization; and the attitude of the nobles in 1789 demonstrated how incurable it was by any merely constitutional modifications. Sir Philip Francis, to whom Burke submitted the proof sheets of the *Reflections*, at once with his usual rapid penetration discerned the weakness of the anti-revolutionary position. "The French of this day," he told

(1) *Bathie*, 380.

Burke, "could not act as we did in 1688. They had no constitution as we had to recur to. They had no foundation to build upon. They had no walls to repair. Much less had they '*the elements of a constitution very nearly as good as could be wished.*' A proposition so extraordinary as this last ought to have been made out *in limine*, since the most important deductions are drawn from it."<sup>1</sup> But, though Burke insisted on drawing his deductions from it with sweeping impetuosity, neither he nor any one else has yet succeeded in establishing that all-important proposition.

What we desire to say, then, comes, in short, to this, that M. Taine has given an exaggerated importance to the literary and speculative activity of the last half century of the old monarchy. In measuring the force of the various antecedents of the Revolution, he has assigned to books and philosophical ideas a place in the scale of dissolvent conditions that belongs more rightly to decayed institutions, to incompetent and incorrigible castes, to economic incongruities that could only be dealt with trenchantly. Books and ideas acquired a certain importance, after other things had finally broken up the crumbling system. They supplied a formula for the accomplished fact. "It was after the Revolution had fairly begun," as a contemporary says, "that they sought in Mably and Rousseau for arms to sustain the system towards which the effervescence of some hardy spirits was dragging affairs. It was not the above-named authors who set people's heads aflame. M. Necker alone produced this effect and determined the explosion."<sup>2</sup>

The predominance of a historic, instead of an abstract school, of political thought could have saved nothing. It could have saved nothing, because the historic or conservative organs and elements of society were incompetent to realise those progressive ideas which were quite as essential to social continuity as the historic ideas. The historic method in political action is only practicable on condition that some at any rate of the great established bodies have the sap of life in their members. In France not even the judiciary, usually the last to part from its ancient roots, was sound and quick. "The administration of justice," says Arthur Young, "was partial, venal, infamous. The conduct of the parliament was profligate and atrocious. The bigotry, ignorance, false principles, and tyranny of these bodies were generally conspicuous."<sup>3</sup> We know what the court was, we know what the noblesse was, and this is what the third great leading order in the realm was. We repeat then that the historic doctrine could get no fulcrum nor leverage, and that only the revolutionary doctrine which the eighteenth century had got ready for the crisis, was adequate to the task of social renovation.

(1) Burke's Corresp. iii. 167.

(2) Sénac de Meilhan, *Du Gouvernement en France*, 129, etc. (1795).

(3) *Travels in France*, i. 603.



Again, we venture to put to M. Taine the following question. If the convulsions of 1789—94 were due to the revolutionary doctrine, if that doctrine was the poison of the movement, how would he explain the firm, manly, steadfast, unhysterical quality of the American revolution thirteen years before, which was theoretically based on exactly the same doctrine? Jefferson and Franklin were as well disciplined in the French philosophy of the eighteenth century as Mirabeau or Robespierre. The Declaration of Independence recites the same abstract and unhistoric propositions as the Declaration of the Rights of Man. Why are we to describe the draught which Rousseau and the others had brewed as a harmless or wholesome prescription for the Americans, and as maddening poison to the French? The answer must be that the quality of the drug is relative to the condition of the patient, and that the vital question for the student of the old régime and the circumstances of its fall, is what other drug, what better process, could have extricated France on more tranquil terms from her desperate case. The American colonists, in spite of the over wide formulæ of their Declaration, really never broke with their past in any of its fundamental elements. They had a historic basis of laws and institutions which was still sound and whole, and the political severance from England made no breach in social continuity. If a different result followed in France, it was not because France was the land of the classic spirit, but because her institutions were inadequate, and her ruling classes incompetent to transform them.

M. Taine's figure of the man who drains the poisonous draught, as having been previously 'a little weak in constitution, but still sound and of peaceful habits,' is surely delusive. The whole evidence shows that France was not sound, but the very reverse of sound, and no inconsiderable portion of that evidence is to be found in the facts which M. Taine has so industriously collected in his own book. The description of France as a little weak in constitution, but still sound and of peaceful habits, is the more surprising to us because M. Taine himself had in an earlier page (p. 109), when summing up the results of Privilege, ended with these emphatic words:—"Déjà avant l'écroulement final, la France est dissoute, et elle est dissoute parce que les privilégiés ont oublié leur caractère d'hommes publics." But then is not this rather more than being a little weak in constitution, but still sound?

EDITOR.

## THE CATHOLIC PERIL IN AMERICA.

How the renewed aggressiveness of the Papal Imperialism is to affect the future of the United States, is a question of vital concern to their citizens; and it is of this country that I am to speak. Hitherto the clergy of the Catholic Church have forborne to raise the question of jurisdiction in any open manner here; they are wisely biding their time, being content for the present with the fact of rapid and enormous growth in numbers, wealth, and power. This masterly inactivity has deceived, and still deceives, great multitudes of educated Americans, who feel the natural aversion which culture always tends to create against "agitation" of all sorts, and who flatter themselves, like the cheercful antediluvians said to have been warned by Noah of the coming Deluge, that "there is not going to be much of a shower." They rely too much on the general influences of civilisation and political freedom as antidotes for Catholic fanaticism; they credulously or indolently accept the smooth professions of American Catholic orators like Father Hecker, who are very glib in the use of popular catchwords, but who are easily understood by any one competent to rate at its actual value the "freedom," "education," and so forth, offered by the Roman Church.

It is my duty to give such statistical information respecting the Catholic Church in the United States as I have been able to collect. It is no easy matter to obtain full and trustworthy religious statistics of any kind; there are too many motives for exaggeration or understatement in sectarian reports, and the United States census reports are exceedingly meagre. Nevertheless, the following facts, taken from the census reports of 1850, 1860, and 1870, are as trustworthy as they are important.

First may be considered the growth in wealth of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, as compared with that of the whole country, and of the leading Protestant denominations.

In 1850, the total property valuation of the United States, according to the census report of that year, was \$7,135,780,228; in 1860, it was \$16,159,616,068; in 1870, it was \$30,068,518,507. That is to say, the aggregate wealth of the country increased about 125 per cent. from 1850 to 1860, and about 86 per cent. from 1860 to 1870.

The total property valuation of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, in 1850, was \$9,256,758; in 1860, it was \$26,774,119; in 1870, it was \$60,985,565. That is to say, the aggregate wealth of the Catholic Church increased about 189 per cent. from 1850 to 1860, and about 128 per cent. from 1860 to 1870.

While, therefore, in the first of these two decades, the wealth of the whole country gained 125 per cent., the wealth of the Catholic Church gained 189 per cent.; and while, in the second decade, the wealth of the whole country gained 86 per cent., the wealth of the Catholic Church gained 128 per cent. Whatever causes may have contributed to this significant result, it is certain that among the chief of them must be reckoned exemption from just taxation, extraordinary shrewdness of financial management, and fraudulent collusion with dishonest politicians.

Further, the relative growth of Protestantism and Catholicism in point of wealth, must by no means be overlooked. In 1850, when the Catholics had \$9,256,758 of church property, the Baptists had \$11,020,855; the Episcopalians, \$11,375,010; the Methodists, \$14,822,870; the Presbyterians, \$14,543,789. In 1870, when the Catholics had \$60,985,566, the Baptists had \$39,229,221; the Episcopalians, \$36,514,549; the Methodists, \$69,854,121; the Presbyterians, \$47,828,732. Thus the Catholics had in 1870 already distanced all their Protestant competitors, with the single exception of the Methodists, and they will soon distance the latter too (if they have not already done so), provided the past is a satisfactory index of the future. For, while in the twenty years from 1850 to 1870 the Methodists, whose astonishing growth is the standing boast of the Evangelical Protestants of this country, made a gain of 371 per cent. in the value of their church property, the Catholics made in the same twenty years a corresponding gain of 558 per cent. At this rate the Roman Catholic Church will have outstripped, at no remote day, the Methodists and all the other Protestant sects combined, in the race for wealth.

No satisfactory information, however, is furnished by the census reports respecting the growth either of the Catholic Church or of the Protestant sects in point of numbers, for they give in each case only the "church accommodations" or "sittings," which by no means indicate the number of worshippers. The total number of sittings, Catholic and Protestant together, was only 21,665,062 in 1870, when the total population of the United States was 38,558,371; that is, considering the actual size of church congregations, fully one-half of the whole population, and in all probability much more, seldom or never go to church at all. In most Protestant churches in this country a great many seats are usually unoccupied, and the number of sittings is largely in excess of the numbers of the congregations. In most Catholic churches, however, the reverse is true, the seats being usually all taken and the aisles often filled, while the same seat is usually occupied by several different persons in the three or four different congregations which fill the church on Sunday at successive services. So far, however, as the number of sittings

alone is concerned, significant results may be easily deduced from the following table constructed upon the data of the census :—

No. of Sitzings.	1850.	1860.	1870.
Protestant . . .	13,567,002	17,724,314	19,674,548
Catholic . . .	667,823	1,401,437	1,990,514
Total . . .	14,234,825	19,128,751	21,665,062

A little calculation, based on these figures, will show that, during the decade 1850—1860, there was an increase of 30 per cent. for the Protestants and 110 per cent. for the Catholics; and that, in the decade 1860—1870, there was an increase of 11 per cent. for the Protestants and nearly 42 per cent. for the Catholics. Notwithstanding the absolute diminution of these rates of increase in the second decade, the relative superiority of the Catholics remained about the same.

The number of church buildings owned by the Catholics in 1850 was 1,222; in 1860, 2,550; in 1870, 3,806. The total number of their ecclesiastical, charitable, and educational organizations in 1870 was 4,127. This is all the information of importance which I have been able to derive from the census reports.

In the silence of the census as to the absolute number of Roman Catholics in this country, all estimates are to be received with caution. Gibson's *Ecclesiastical Almanac* for 1869 states the increase of Protestants (in the loose sense of that word) to have been from 21,000,000 to 27,000,000 between the years 1859 and 1868, and that of Catholics from 2,500,000 to 5,000,000; in the former case an increase of 29 per cent. in nine years, and in the latter case an increase of 100 per cent. in the same period. At this rate of increase the number of Catholics in the United States at present cannot be far from 9,000,000, and by the end of the century will exceed that of the total non-Catholic population. Certain it is that the Catholics have been boasting for many years that they will elect their own President in the year 1900. The third revised edition of Professor Schem's "Statistics of the World for 1875" estimates the number of our Catholic population as 6,000,000. The *American Annual Cyclopædia* for 1875 estimates it as more than 6,000,000, and states that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States has 1 cardinal, 8 archbishops, 54 bishops, 4,873 priests, 4,731 churches, 1,902 chapels, 68 colleges, and 511 academies.

How the Catholics themselves arrive at an estimate of their own numbers in the United States, and how plausible a ground it gives to their confident anticipation of eventual supremacy, appears from the statements of the *New York Catholic World*, the leading periodical of the Church published in America. The Catholic rule is to allow

an average of 2,000 people (men, women, and children) to each parish priest—a rule which is claimed to be proved correct by experience. Allowing 4,500 to be the number of such priests, the Catholic population would be 9,000,000, and I am inclined to consider this a pretty good guess, in the absence of exact census returns. This is the remarkable account of the progress of the Church. In 1776 the Catholics numbered about 25,000; in 1789 they were 30,000, in a population of about 3,000,000, or one one-hundredth of the whole; in 1808 they were 100,000, in a population of 6,500,000, or one-sixty-fifth of the whole; in 1830 they were 450,000, in a total of 13,000,000, or one-twenty-ninth of the whole; in 1840 they were 960,000, in a total of 17,070,000, or one-eighteenth of the whole; in 1850 they were 2,150,000, in a total of 23,191,000, or one-eleventh of the whole; in 1860 they were 4,400,000, in a total of 31,000,000, or one-seventh of the whole; in 1870 they were 8,500,000, in a total of some 40,000,000, or over a fifth of the whole. For a period of forty years—from 1830 to 1870—Catholics thus more than doubled their number every decade, while the general population increased at the rate of about 35 per cent. The explanation of this wonderful fact is to be found in the vast immigration from Ireland and other Catholic countries—Ireland alone sending to these shores over 2,000,000 of emigrants from 1830 to 1870. These statements give the Catholic view of the subject—my authority being the *Catholic World*, as epitomized by Father Stack in *Harper's Weekly* for July 3, 1875.

Notwithstanding this wonderful growth of the Roman Church in numbers, as compared with that of the general population and the various Protestant sects, the Catholics themselves, while pointing exultingly to the rapid progress of their Church, at the same time deplore a great and constant defection of Catholic-born children from the faith of their parents. In a letter written in 1836 to the Central Council for the Propagation of the Faith at Lyons, Bishop England, of Charleston, South Carolina, communicated the following statements relative to the condition of the Church in the United States:—

“I have long been under the impression that not only in Europe, but even in the United States, very delusive fancies have been entertained of the progress of the Catholic Church in our Union, and even many mistakes as to the means most conducive to its propagation. I have no doubt upon my mind that within fifty years *millions* have been lost to the Catholic Church in the United States. . . . Nothing can be more plain than that, instead of an increase of the members *naturally* belonging to the Catholic Church in the United States, there has been actually a serious loss. . . . I do not mean to say that the number of Catholics is in this day less than it was fifty years ago, nor as small as it was five years since: but I do assert that the loss of numbers to the Catholic Church has been exceedingly great, when we take into account the Catholic population at the time of the American Revolution, the acquisition of

territory previously occupied by Catholics, the arrivals of Catholic emigrants, and the conversions to the Catholic religion."

Estimating the number of Catholics in the United States at that time (1836) as 1,200,000, the bishop goes through some calculations, and adds:—

"If I say, upon the foregoing data, that we ought, if there were no loss, to have five millions of Catholics, and that we have less than a million and a quarter, there must be a loss of three millions and three quarters; and the persons so lost are found amongst the various sects to the amount of thrice the number of the Catholic population of the whole country."

In the same strain the New York *Irish World* of July 25, 1874, published a very long and elaborate article to prove that 18,000,000 of Catholics have thus been lost to the Church. It says:—

"What ought to be the Catholic population of the United States to-day? To this we answer that the *natural product* of Catholic immigration to this country, from its first settlement to this day, without counting in one solitary convert, ought to be 28,000,000. The Catholic population is, in fact, but 10,000,000. Ecclesiastical statisticians put the figures all the way from 5,000,000 to 8,000,000. Hardly any of them go above the latter figure. We are convinced, however, there are 10,000,000 who were baptized Catholics. But even at this there are 18,000,000, lost to the Church; that is, there are 18,000,000 more of the population of the United States who, either by immediate birth or by right of descent from first settlers, ought to be professed Catholics, but who now are to be found in the ranks of Protestantism or Nothingarianism."

It is not necessary to accept the figures of the *Irish World* as even approximately accurate; in fact, they are deserving of little consideration, when we find that, out of the total white population of 3,172,461 in the original thirteen colonies at the close of the Revolutionary war, 1,903,200 are claimed as "Celtic (Irish, Scotch, Welsh, French, etc.);" Nevertheless, amazing as has been the growth of the Catholic Church in this country, there cannot be the least doubt that its present membership would be very much larger than it is, had its rate of increase not been constantly diminished by a steady stream of deserters from the rising generations. Bishop England and the *Irish World* make no mistake in emphasizing this fact as of supreme importance to the future destiny of the Church. It is a fact which the *Irish World* labours to account for by "Ireland's subjection to England;" but the prelates, priests, and intelligent laity of the Church perfectly comprehend the true cause of it. They know that the great defection of Catholic children from the Catholic faith is caused by their constant contact with decatholicizing influences in a predominantly non-Catholic community—an "evil" which they are powerless to prevent; they know that these influences necessarily act upon the children with greater or less effect in the free public schools; they know that, unless they can succeed in isolating the children of Catholics from

the children of non-Catholics, and subjecting them to exclusively Catholic influences in their tender and impressible years, the hold of the Church upon their obedience must and does grow very feeble, and is soon lost in a great many cases; they know that the general effect of our public school system, though no effort at proselytism is permitted, is to quicken the intellect of the children so far as to render them indocile under a *régime* of authoritative faith. They have therefore adopted the fixed policy of aiming at the total destruction of our public school system, at least as now conducted. Those who wish to read an elaborate, able, and fanatical condensation of the Catholic view of this question will find it in "Public School Education," a duodecimo volume of over four hundred pages, written by the Rev. Michael Müller, and published by D. and J. Sadlier, of New York. The policy of the American bishops in this matter is simply the practical application and vigorous enforcement of the principles of the Encyclical and Syllabus; and there is no possibility of its being changed till these manifestoes are recalled.

The attack began with complaints of the use of the Protestant Bible, read "without note or comment," in the schools. There is inherent justice in this complaint, and I must concede that, in protesting against taxation for the support of evangelical or semi-evangelical schools, the Catholics command the sympathy of all who believe in secular instruction alone in State schools. But they do not stop there; they really want, not that the Bible should be excluded, but that it should be supplemented by Catholic interpreters and Catholic surroundings; they will be satisfied with nothing short of putting the whole school system under the practical control of the Catholic clergy, or of partitioning out the school funds among the various denominations, or of excusing the Catholic laity from all taxation for school purposes. What they have set their faces against is State education in any shape; Protestant schools are bad enough, but secular or "godless" schools are, in their eyes, still worse. But the whole fabric of our educational, nay, of our national, system rests on the clear right of the State to educate its voters, in sheer self-defence against internal dissolution through illiteracy and its universally concomitant crime and pauperism. Wherever universal suffrage prevails, universal education must also prevail, as the indispensable means of securing that universal intelligence without which no free commonwealth is possible; in fact, the principle of "compulsory," (or, better, *guaranteed*) education, is more and more evidently needed to attain the desired object.

In Cincinnati, during the winter of 1869—1870, the action of the Board of Education in explicitly prohibiting Bible-reading in the schools of that city led to long litigation, and ultimately, in December, 1872, to the sanction of their action by the Supreme

Court of Ohio. In this case (a full and interesting report of which can be obtained from Robert Clarke, and Co., of Cincinnati), the Catholics were more or less implicated. I quote from the argument of George R. Sage, Esq., before the Superior Court :—

“ From the year 1829 to the year 1842, the Bible, without note or comment, was read in the schools, no one objecting. There were then no Catholic parochial schools. The Bishop of the Catholic Church—he who is now Archbishop—was for some time a member of the Board of Examiners, and active in support of the schools. In 1842 the first intimation of an objection was made. It was not to the reading of the Bible, but that Catholic children were required to read the ‘Protestant Bible and Testament.’ The Board promptly and unanimously conceded everything suggested by the objection. From that time until the year 1852, no further objection was made. The Bible was read, and the schools prospered. In 1852 the next move was made. Almost simultaneously a similar movement in the interest of the Catholic Church was made throughout the country. It is said that this was in accordance with the action of a secret conclave of the authorities of that Church held in the city of Baltimore. Whether such was the fact is not material. A Catholic member of the Board, in the interest of the Catholic Church, presented a series of resolutions, admitting the necessity of reading the Bible in the schools, and authorising the introduction of the translation approved by the Catholics, and that approved by the Jews, and their use by those preferring them. The Board, upon assurance that its action would be satisfactory, enacted a rule granting all that the resolutions called for. The next year the Catholic parochial schools were established, and the whole power of the Catholic Church was arrayed against the public schools. The Board, in its annual report for that year, announced that they were ‘constrained to infer that no union of action or system is intended or desired by the assailants of the public schools upon any terms but such as are incompatible with the principles and usages which thus far have sustained the free schools of this country.’ ”

It is not easy, in reading this record of the tortuous policy pursued by the Church, to be satisfied with the degree of good faith which it manifested. Its demands to-day are inconsistent with public schools of any kind which are practically uncontrolled by itself, as is evident from Archbishop Purcell's communication to the Cincinnati Board, on September 18, 1869 :—

“ The entire government of public schools in which Catholic youth are educated cannot be given over to the civil power. We, as Catholics, cannot approve of that system of education for youth which is apart from instruction in the Catholic faith and the teaching of the Church. If the School Board can offer anything in conformity with these principles, as has been done in England, France, Canada, Prussia, and other countries, where the rights of conscience in the matter of education have been fully recognised, I am prepared to give it respectful consideration.—JOHN B. PURCELL, *Archbishop of Cincinnati.* ”

Not to multiply quotations unnecessarily, I will only add the following remarkably bold and explicit passage from the Lenten Pastoral of Bishop Gilmour, of Cleveland, Ohio, in 1873 :—

“ At present [note the implication of this *at present*] we have nothing to hope from the State. Yet we must not therefore cease to insist upon our rights, and, if needs be, at the polls demand them. Were Catholics alive and united on the school question,—were they to demand from every man who asks their



vote a pledge that he would vote for our just share of the school fund,—legislators would learn to respect the Catholic vote, and give us our just rights. . . . But in the meantime what are we to do? Fold our arms and sit idle? Let our children grow up in ignorance, and so be beaten in the race of life? Send them to the public schools, where not only their faith will be endangered, but their virtues exposed? No, a hundred times no! We must build Catholic schools everywhere, and at whatever cost support and lift them up till they are equal to the best. It is our solemn injunction and most positive command that every church in the diocese have its schools. Where a congregation cannot at once build both church and school, let them build the school-house and wait for the church. There is little danger of the old losing their faith, but there is every danger that the young will. On the school question there can be and there must be no division. Either we are Catholics or we are not. If we are Catholics, we must leave after us a Catholic youth. And experience has clearly proved this cannot be done, unless the children are early taught and daily taught that they are Catholics. We must not sleep while our enemies are working. Nor must we forget that the public schools are organized and managed for and in the interests of Protestantism. We solemnly charge and most positively require every Catholic in the diocese to support and send his children to a Catholic school. When *good* Catholic schools exist, and where it may be honestly said a child will get a fair common-school education, if parents either through contempt for the priest, or disregard for the laws of the Church, or for trifling and insufficient reasons, refuse to send their children to a Catholic school, then in such cases, but in such cases only, we authorise confessors to refuse the sacraments to such parents as thus despise the laws of the Church, and disobey the command of both priest and bishop."

This Lenten Pastoral of Bishop Gilmour, which excited a great commotion in Ohio, and contributed not a little to the remarkable agitation of the school question in the subsequent political campaign of 1875 in that State, was vigorously replied to at the time by the Rev. T. B. Forbush, a Unitarian clergyman of Cleveland, whose lectures and addresses rendered important service in securing the defeat of the Catholic-Democratic coalition of the last season.

No doubt can be left in the mind of any one who even superficially studies this subject, that the entire forces of the Catholic Church (excepting only here and there an isolated and half-liberalised Catholic, like Senator Kernan, of New York, or Mayor Kelby, of Richmond) are gradually becoming massed in determined opposition to the public school system, or that their opposition, which is already arousing an aggressive Evangelical reaction, threatens to destroy even the present imperfect secularism of the schools, and thereby ultimately the public school system itself; for it may be safely said that American voters will certainly refuse to be taxed for the support of other men's religions, and that, if they cannot agree to support public schools independent of all religions, they will sooner or later refuse to be taxed for public schools of any sort. And the worst peril of the Catholic agitation at present is the possibility of its so inflaming the jealousy and bigotry of Protestants as to lead to a general adoption of church-schools, or (worse even than that) the effective and permanent fortification of the present sectarian features

of the public schools by the adoption of measures which, as I shall show below, must involve a tremendous revolution in the whole theory of American politics.

The degree of success already achieved by the Catholic clergy in alienating the affections of their flocks from the public school system, may be seen by the public boast of Bishop McQuaid, of Rochester, New York, who said four years ago : " There are at the present time not far from one hundred thousand Catholic children in the Christian free schools of the State of New York"—*i.e.*, in the parochial schools supported voluntarily by Catholics. Turning over the leaves of *Sadlier's Catholic Directory*, in every diocese there is seen to be a long list of such schools, with a large number of pupils in each ; but the labour of adding them all up, which would be herculean, is left to the reader. It is evident that the parochial school system is in a highly flourishing condition, and must be supported by the vast majority of the Catholic laity. Whoever imagines (and multitudes of otherwise intelligent persons in this country indulge the imagination) that the Catholic laity cannot be depended upon to follow the lead of their clergy in opposition to the public school system, should devote a few hours to a careful inspection of this *Directory*. To select the very first list of parochial schools, that of the archdiocese of Baltimore, as an illustration, he would find 61 schools, with a total attendance of 13,916 scholars, and an average attendance of about 240. A similar showing is made in all the other archdioceses, dioceses, and vicariates apostolic. Of course there are not a few individual Catholics who are too lax in the faith to give up the substantial advantages of a public school education for their children, even for the threats or promises of the Church ; and for the present the ecclesiastical authorities tolerate a certain amount even of open opposition. But it is the extreme of credulity to be deceived by such facts as these into doubting the fixity of the ecclesiastical purpose or the certainty of general lay compliance. The parochial system is so flourishing, and so well sustained by lay contributions, as already to have seriously reduced the attendance at the public schools in many places, and in a few (as in some parts of Brooklyn, I believe) to have almost broken them up. Bishop McQuaid declared, in 1871, that the city of Rochester, New York, in which he resides, had 4,000 children in the Catholic schools, and 5,500 in the public schools ; and he added, in the same spirit as that of Bishop Gilmour's above-quoted Lenten Pastoral : " In the years to come we shall be more occupied with school-building, and with the education of our children, than the erecting of churches, although this work will not be permitted to stand still."

Bishop Ryan, of Buffalo, like every bishop who has spoken publicly on the subject, has declared the same policy, and avowed himself "a

stern, avowed, and uncompromising enemy" of all schools in which positive instruction in the Catholic faith is not given. The result of this unanimous policy has been to tax heavily the pockets of the people, who have nevertheless cheerfully submitted in the main.

But the Catholic warfare against secular State education, is not alone manifested by the establishment of a great independent system of Church schools: it adapts itself to circumstances. Wherever the Church can get control of the public schools, it does not scruple to do so; and, if the Catholics ever become the majority, as they confidently expect, their objections to State education will vanish. The Louisville, Kentucky, *Catholic Advocate*, of August 12, 1875, published the following letter:—

"East St. Louis, Ill., August 4th, 1875.

"*Editor Catholic Advocate.*—Yours of the 28th ult. was received, but, being absent from home, I could not answer you ere this. The scrap of news hailing from East St. Louis is true. The Board of Education permits us to select our own teachers, and they are approved of by the Board according to law. Catechism is taught outside of school hours in the school-rooms. Our text-books are all right. You seem anxious to know how comes it that our schools are supported by the public funds. Well, it is this wise: the majority of our population are Catholics, and they elect Catholic directors. This is the key that solves the grant. You may make any comment you please. I simply give the facts as required.

Yours very respectfully,

"P. J. O'FALLORAN, V.F."

Some of the comments on this letter, made by the editor of the *Catholic Advocate*, are so instructive, and throw so much light on the subject under discussion, that I must not omit them, considering that the original words are more satisfactory than any paraphrase of my own:—

"Catholics may from this plainly see for themselves that the settlement of this fretted question depends altogether on votes. In cities where justice to Catholics is most easy, there are always a sufficient number of Catholic voters to turn the tide of election in any way they please, if they will but unite and intelligently use their franchise, the only argument that can reach the non-Catholic public. It is by no means necessary that Catholics should be in a majority in a community to obtain a division of the school-fund—a small return for what they yearly pay for this purpose into the public treasury. It is only necessary that they should allow politicians to divide among themselves, as their own ambition and pecuniary interest will always divide them, and then cast the weight of the Catholic vote in favour of every good man who is willing to support the Catholic claim for justice. In this way a comparatively small band of voters may elect to office men of their own principles."

The whole world knows how New York city lay for years at the mercy of a gang of thieves and robbers called the Tammany Ring, who stole millions upon millions of the public money, and kept themselves in power by the Catholic vote, which was always ready to support such "good" men as Tweed, Sweeney, Connolly, Hall, Barnard, McCann. In 1869, 1870, and part of 1871, under the

*régime* of this precious set, sectarian appropriations out of the money raised by tax on the property of New York citizens were made to 103 Catholic institutions, including churches, hospitals, parochial schools, and so forth, to the amount of \$1,396,389. During the same time, appropriations were made to Protestant institutions to the amount of \$112,293, and to Hebrew institutions to the amount of \$25,852: both together, \$138,145. All this money was virtually stolen money. The Protestants accepted 7 per cent., and the Catholics 91 per cent. Over and above this, in 1869, the Catholics got \$178,672, the Protestants \$6,500, and the Hebrews and others \$29,788 of excise money. And the same story must be told of the succeeding years, even after the downfall of the Ring, the amounts only being less, down to the 1st of January, 1875, when the exasperated people put a summary stop to all further sectarian stealings by an amendment to the State Constitution. But the debt of New York city, according to Comptroller Green's statement, amounted, on October 1, 1875, to \$131,113,906.74; and for a very large, if not the major, part of this enormous debt the Catholic vote must be held responsible, since without it the rogues could not have committed their robberies, nor their insatiate party remained in power. In this manner the Catholic Church, accepting largesses of money which it well knew to be stolen property, built up its costly parochial schools for the better training of its children in the elements of morals. If it should be held to be directly implicated in the thefts by which it so largely profited, and to be consequently unfitted for giving instruction in any morals but those of the pickpocket, it might protest against the severity of such a judgment, but would find it extraordinarily difficult to dispute its justice. So far as they shared in this public iniquity, the Protestants and Hebrews also must share in the public disgrace; but the chief offenders have the chief title to the unenviable distinction it confers. There is little cause for surprise if the astonishing growth of the Catholic Church, and its relentless hostility to thoroughly honest education as given in the public schools, have excited grave disquietude in the minds of all American citizens who do not favour a general corruption of public morals.

Perceiving, then, how easy it is in this country for an unprincipled minority to acquire controlling power, and how ready the Catholic Church is to aid and abet their plots for its own sinister purposes, and how mischievously it is already using its great political influence to compass the destruction of our only real safeguard, the public school system, every intelligent and sincere friend of free institutions must deplore the garrulous fatuity which so loudly and frequently urges that because the Catholics are only a minority they are not to-day dangerous. Is it so new a thing for a

minority to govern? Did not a minority of 300,000 slaveholders conquer the whole United States, compelling us, for many decades, to obey their own imperious will? Did not a ridiculously small minority, the Tammany Ring, conquer the City and State of New York, ruling and robbing without check, because they were cunning and organized, while the great public were stupid, indifferent, and disunited? What gigantic and persistent efforts were necessary to break the sceptre of this half-dozen of treasury-pilferers, and how small has been the success of those who tried to punish the robbers and recover the plunder! Minority, indeed! But has not the world been ruled by minorities from time immemorial? The Catholic party is certainly a minority, nevertheless it is to-day winning victory after victory over the great helpless majority, and will continue to do so, fastening itself on the neck of the nation, like the Old Man of the Sea on the neck of Sindbad the Sailor, unless the majority have sense enough to open their eyes and enact the measures necessary for the preservation of their liberties. The elements of its power are chiefly these:—

The Roman Catholic Church is a *universal, political power, foreign nowhere, but everywhere at home*—a Theocratic Imperialism of the most absolute character, both spiritual and temporal—a system of government claiming and exercising the most despotic authority over the action of every one of its subjects, in political just as much as in private concerns. It commands the conscience and the suffrage of every Catholic citizen in support of every measure which it judges advantageous to its own interests, and thus lays an iron hand on the very roots of all political power. It wields this power solely with an eye to its own aggrandizement, and aims at a universal dominion, which is hostile to every fundamental principle of the United States Constitution and of modern civilisation.

In America, where everything is done by voluntary association, and where Protestant organizations are forced to enter into competition with the Catholic Church, the superior efficiency of the latter as an organization is indicated unmistakably in the statistics of their relative growth given above. There is no "canon law," technically considered, which is recognized by the civil courts of the United States; and the priests enjoy none of the protection against the arbitrary authority of their bishops which the "canon law" itself confers. This is a so-called "missionary country," in which the dioceses, however, are governed by canonical bishops, not by vicars apostolic; and the sixty-four bishops constitute a close corporation, with absolute power over the priests, who are thus mere slaves of episcopal domination. Further, the title to the entire Church property of each diocese is vested in the bishop in fee simple; and the laity are thus as powerless as the priests against him. Lastly, the

Catholic press is as completely under episcopal control as the priesthood and the laity. This absolute concentration of all substantial power, alike over pulpit, property, and press, makes the bishops the most thoroughly despotic body in the land, and gives them a degree of power greater than they possess in any other country. The appointment of Cardinal McCloskey has completed the structure of Catholic ecclesiastical absolutism, against which there is no powerful barrier except the general protective influences of free political and educational institutions. Whether this protection will prove adequate or not, or whether it must be supplemented by positive restrictive legislation, is a question for the future to decide. Unfortunately, the case is complicated by the existence of a rival, but much feebler spirit of propagandism among Protestant sects, which dangerously retards the establishment of that absolute separation of Church and State which is the vital principle of American republicanism.

Again, the wealth of the Catholic Church, which is the great weapon of its ambition, is accumulating, as I have already shown, far more rapidly than the general wealth of the country. By their individual tenure of all Church property, the bishops are enabled to manage it as they please; and they are shrewd enough to invest it as much as possible in real estate, holding it untaxed in consequence of the policy of exemption by which the States are preparing a bitter future for themselves, and leaving it to rise in value by the labours of the outside world. In addition to the constant contributions they collect in small sums from servant girls and other poor Catholics, they thus contrive to levy taxes on the general community, and put their hands into the pocket of every business man in the nation. History and experience go for nothing with the preoccupied and apathetic public, who submit to all this in the half-defined but insane notion that somehow or other the laws of nature are not the same here as in the Old World. Meanwhile the process continues, and the Roman Catholic Church is fast becoming the richest corporation in the land, with all its despotic money-power in the hands of an episcopal "Roman Ring," who use it in making it greater and more effective still for the overthrow of free institutions.

But greater than all these sources of strength put together, is the weakness of the public conscience and the unsuspectingness of the public intelligence. The people have too long submitted, half angrily, half lazily, to the control of caucus managers, petty rings, and utterly selfish politicians, who are all ready to make any sacrifice for immediate partisan success, and therefore to make any bargain, however corrupt, with those who hold the balance of power. Here is the unguarded point in the defences of the public freedom. It is this moral and mental weakness of the people themselves, their blindness to the duty of the hour or their criminal negligence in perform-

ing it, which makes the Catholic minority so dangerous to the country.

Such are the chief elements of power, though many more might be enumerated, possessed by the Roman Catholic Church in its assault on the public schools, and (through them) all free institutions. But the real peril lies less in the present actual extent of this power than in the character of the reaction excited by its direct assault on the system of State education. Catholic ambition is rousing Protestant Evangelical ambition to new and dangerous manifestations; and between these rivalries of religious fanaticism, each party aiming at political power, I believe that the institutions of the Republic are certain to be subjected to a strain severer than any they have hitherto experienced. There are three leading forms assumed by the distinctively Protestant reaction against Catholic assaults on the public school system:—

1. A movement to surrender State education altogether, and to fall back on a system of denominational schools. This movement, which adopts the Catholic premise that doctrinal religious education is paramount in importance to all other, and which has been to some extent carried out by the establishment of Church schools of various Protestant sects, has not been a very influential one hitherto. But its ideas have been stated with great force in the *New York Tribune* of December 9, 1875, by the Rev. John Miller, in a letter headed "State Schools a Mistake."

2. A movement to defend State education as now conducted, including reading of the Bible "without note or comment," and also Protestant hymns and prayers. This movement represents the fixed determination of the vast majority of Evangelical Protestants, as proved by the almost unanimous declarations of their ecclesiastical assemblages; although some influential journals whose orthodoxy is very imperfect—as, for instance, the *New York Christian Union* and *Independent*—are in favour of secular schools.

3. A movement to fortify the existing advantages of Evangelical Protestantism, both in the political and educational institutions of the nation, by securing the adoption of a doctrinal amendment of the United States constitution, incorporating into its preamble a distinct national recognition of Protestant Christianity. This movement, of which I shall speak again, is numerically weak, but represents the logical necessity to which the Evangelical party will be driven by events, if the agitation of the Catholic question continues.

These are the three phases of Protestant reaction, as such, against the aggressive activity of the Roman Catholic Church. Of course there are a great many individual members of the Protestant sects who favour the principle of absolutely secular education in our

public schools, and who will fail to act with their fellow-believers at the ballot-box. But, on the other hand, a great many persons who are totally disconnected with any Protestant sect, will be sure to vote in support of the Evangelical policy, whether from social, business, political, or other interested motives. Notwithstanding the wild and sanguine hopes of many liberals, and notwithstanding the loose boastfulness of superficial and flippant writers for the daily press, no intelligent observer can seriously doubt that the vast preponderance of political power is at present on the side of Evangelical Protestantism, whenever it chooses to assert itself at the polls; or that its strength lies chiefly in its rapidly consolidating organization, its wealth, its social supremacy, and its power to gratify or defeat political aspirations; or that its strength is relatively decreasing every day under the opposite encroachments of "Romanism and Infidelity" on its domain; or that the instinct of self-preservation, together with the natural conservatism of all power and wealth, will drive it to give desperate battle in defence of its existing privileges rather than submit to deprivation of them by either of the foes that hem it in. While the great struggle over the slavery question continued, public attention was withdrawn from religious issues to a large extent. But now there is no longer any question of universal, absorbing interest before the people which can be compared for a moment with the question—*What shall be the permanent religious character of American civilisation?* Every indication of the deeper currents of thought and feeling points to an approaching contest of unprecedented proportions in working out a practical solution of this mighty problem; and, roughly outlined, three great religious parties are now in the field, destined each to play a momentous part in the immediate future. The Centennial Year of the national existence marks the beginning of a political epoch, of unknown duration, in which religion is evidently to take the lead of all public issues; and these three parties are slowly gathering themselves together for a struggle that must be for ever memorable in the history of the race.

The first of these parties—the Roman Catholic Church—I have already sufficiently described as it exists in the United States. Its power has been sufficiently proved by the fact that it has deliberately selected the field of battle for the first great shock of arms—namely, the public school system. It has also selected its own time, and made the first attack in force, and compelled its antagonists to assume the defensive attitude.

The second of the three parties is the Protestant Evangelical party, not compacted into one powerful organization like the Catholic Church, but composed of several great sects, and a swarm of minor ones, and weakened by mutual jealousies, discordant interests, and rival ambitions. But, politically considered, it is very likely to unite on



some definite measure which shall be "unsectarian" as to its own component factions, yet "sectarian" as to both Catholics and "infidels," whom it dreads and hates as heartily as it does the Catholics. It has taken up the phrase, "non-sectarian schools," as its watchword; but by this it means the schools as now conducted, with Protestant prayers, hymns, and scriptures. The studied ambiguity of this phrase—which, properly interpreted, would satisfy the friends of positive or secular education, is one of the dangerous elements of the situation. That the present school system is rendered in the large and true sense sectarian by the support of Protestant worship, would be stoutly denied by the vast majority of Protestant Evangelicals; but they are prepared to fight to the death in defence of this strictly sectarian worship, as the flag of Protestantism floating over the public schools. This was a leading issue in the Ohio campaign during the summer and autumn of 1875; and it promises to be a leading issue in the Presidential campaign of 1876. It is only by keeping the ambiguity of the word "sectarian" in mind that recent events can be understood in their full significance.

On September 29, at Des Moines, Iowa, President Grant made at the Reunion of the Army of the Tennessee, one of the most important speeches ever delivered in this country, for it marked the definite introduction of the school question into national politics. Taking his cue from this speech, the Hon. James G. Blaine, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a well-known aspirant for the Presidency, wrote a private letter to an Ohio friend, under date of October 20th, proposing a form of amendment to the Constitution. This letter was not published till more than a month later, when it made a great sensation; and on December 14th, Mr. Blaine formally proposed his amendment in the House, with slight modifications, as follows:—

"No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor or any public lands devoted thereto, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect; and no money or lands so devoted shall be divided among religious sects or denominations."

This amendment is a direct blow aimed at the Roman Catholic Church in the interest of Evangelical Protestantism; for, if passed, it will defeat the Catholic effort to get control of or else divide the school funds, and at the same time will leave the Protestants in undisturbed mastery of the schools themselves. Mr. Blaine's proposition is a pretty evident bid for the support of the Evangelical party in the approaching political contest. But the President, in his annual message to Congress, dated December 7th, had already recommended measures still more sweeping, which have astounded the country by their boldness, and perplexed all parties alike. They

include, among other things, the taxation of all Church property (with "possibly" the exception of Church edifices), the establishment of compulsory education so far as to make illiteracy a cause of disenfranchisement after 1890, and the formal declaration that Church and State shall be for ever separate and distinct. With reference to the schools, I quote his language:—

"As the primary step, therefore, to our advancement in all that has marked our progress in the past century, I suggest for your earnest consideration, and most earnestly recommend it, that a Constitutional Amendment be submitted to the legislatures of the several States for ratification, making it the duty of the several States to establish, and forever maintain, free public schools adequate to the education of all the children in the rudimentary branches within their respective limits, irrespective of sex, colour, birthplace, or religion, forbidding the teaching in said schools of religious, atheistic, or Pagan tenets, and prohibiting the granting of any school funds or school taxes, or any part thereof, either by legislative, municipal, or other authority, for the benefit, or in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination, or in aid, or for the benefit of any other object of any nature or kind whatever."

It is at present uncertain whether the President means to include Protestant worship under "teaching religious tenets;" but the courts could hardly construe the phrase so strictly. His language, like Mr. Blaine's, is open to more than a single construction; and it would hardly be just to insist on any particular one. Unfortunately, ambiguous phrasology is no new thing in American politics. But the floodgates are opened, and the public must be prepared for a deluge of propositions to amend the Constitution. It is a grave and anxious time for patriots. The school question is now fairly up for discussion and decision, and the form it has inevitably taken—that of a constitutional amendment—cannot fail to call public attention to another proposed amendment, which has been lying for years like a lighted slow-match near a powder-magazine.

The Protestant Evangelical party are evidently determined not to consent to the thorough secularization of the school system; they are doggedly resolved to keep the Bible in the schools. Starting with this foregone conclusion, there is an extreme left wing of the party which discerns the defective legal guarantees for the perpetuation of religious worship in the schools, and is shrewd enough to see that there is no way to perpetuate it without some formal recognition of Protestant Christianity in the fundamental law of the land. Every great question, like the slavery question, must be finally settled in this country by a constitutional amendment. To "defend the existing Christian features of the government" (for, notwithstanding the theoretical separation of Church and State, we have many such "survivals" of a pre-national period), these long-headed men, with the enthusiasm which is easily generated by clear conviction in logical minds, declare the absolute necessity to their cause of some adequate change in the Constitution, which is, thanks to the wisdom of its heterodox framers, a purely secular document from beginning

to end, and contains not a clause or word by which, in the United States' Courts, the "Christian features" alluded to could possibly be defended against a strong effort for their abolition. Consequently they propose to amend the preamble of the Constitution, which is its enacting clause, so as "suitably to express our national recognition of Almighty God as the author of national existence and the source of all power and authority in civil government, of Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and of the Bible as the fountain of law, and the supreme rule for the conduct of nations."

"The birth of the movement for this purpose," says the Rev. David MacAllister, one of the leaders of it, "may be dated from the 4th day of February, 1863." Its first convention was held at Xenia, Ohio; and a similar convention, without any knowledge of the other, was held at Sparta, Illinois, on February 6th, of the same year. Since then, numerous conventions have been held in different parts of the country on behalf of the movement, and have been usually largely attended and widely reported. United States' Senators, Governors, Judges of the Supreme Courts of the United States and of many States and territories, presidents and professors of colleges, bishops and clergymen of many denominations, and numerous dignitaries of all sorts, have been found to lend the sanction of their names to these conventions and the object for which they are held. A weekly journal is published in Philadelphia as the organ of the movement, called the *Christian Statesman*, and edited by the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, an able and earnest man. A National Reform Association is about to be incorporated for the more effectual prosecution of the cause. Public petitions for this "Christian Amendment," as it has been appropriately designated by those who perceive that its real object is to make Christianity the established religion of the United States, have long been circulating for signature; and it has been declared that 2,000,000 signatures are to be collected and presented to Congress in its support by the next 4th of July. That this movement is a thoroughly vital one, and certain sooner or later to create a fanatical enthusiasm of a very dangerous character, I became more than ever profoundly convinced on attending the national convention of these men at Cincinnati in 1872. It is a movement strong with all the strength of fixed moral purpose and of logic applied unanswerably to the universally accepted premises of the Evangelical Protestant faith; and now that the time is evidently drawing near for amending the Constitution with reference to the religious issue, those who are determined to keep the banner of Protestant Christianity flying over the public schools will soon come to see that they cannot ultimately succeed except through the success of this Christian Amendment. All that is wanting is to "fire the Evangelical heart;" and if the aggressiveness of Rome cannot

do this, nothing can. President Grant's proposed amendment is not enough; Mr. Blaine's is not enough; nothing but this thorough-going Christian Amendment will impregnably fortify the Bible in the schools. The brain and the soul of the whole Protestant party are in this body of extremists—this squad of determined soldiers of the Cross, who have carried on undauntedly their weary thirteen years' warfare in the face of indifference and opposition, and now see the decisive hour approaching. I know the tone of intense moral enthusiasm, as every one does who ever heard Garrison and Phillips and their followers in the anti-slavery warfare; and it is a perilous thing for liberty when a manifest spirit like that of the "original abolitionists" can be enlisted in the cause of a Christian Amendment. For this measure means disfranchisement and disability to hold office for every conscientious free-thinker; and that means the concentration of all political power in the hands of bigots with conscience, or hypocrites without it; and that must mean, in the end, a million-fold more cruel civil war than the one that so lately filled the land with blood and with tears. Need more be said?

This, then, is the Catholic peril in America—not alone that the Roman Catholic Church may become a ruling majority, or (what is worse) a ruling minority, with all the measureless miseries and mischiefs of such rule, but that, in order to strengthen the Republic against the possibility of such rulership, the great Protestant party may resort to measures involving a revolutionary subversion of the fundamental principle of the Republic itself. For a hundred years our national life has been slowly developing into a more complete accordance with the principle that the Church and the State can be and ought to be wholly separate. To reverse this principle now would be national ruin—a melancholy failure of the experiment of establishing a great civilisation on universal reverence for the rights of man. It would not be our loss alone, but the world's as well; for the vitality of American institutions is in their strictly universal and cosmopolitan character, and in their adaptability to every community which has reached a certain average of popular intelligence and independence of character.

To defeat all such changes, and to carry forward to a higher, fuller, and nobler realisation the national ideal of a purely secular government, is the one object of the third great party of which I spoke. By this term I mean the vast unorganized body of all those who accept in its fulness the conception of a State absolutely emancipated from all ecclesiastical dictation or influence, and who intelligently defend the total separation of State and Church. Many such may be found, doubtless, among the nominal Protestants—a few among the nominal Catholics; but the great majority are unconnected with ecclesiastical organizations. In this age of slowly disintegrating beliefs,

the positive conception of a purely secular or civil State finds a hearty welcome in many minds which are not yet wholly rid of all contradictory conceptions; the contradictions, however, may be unconsciously harboured and practically inoperative, so far as conduct is concerned. All such are Liberals, in the broad sense I intend; and the true Liberal party must be held to include all citizens who comprehend and embrace the principle of absolutely secular government, whatever their opinions may be in religious matters.

Now this great third party, being unorganized, is of yet undetermined strength. For the first time in our national history, questions are arising for solution at the polls which will reveal its actual numbers and power. But their political programme, enumerating the points on which reform is actually required in order to render the State totally secular in its administration as well as in its theory, has been drawn up as follows in the so-called "Demands of Liberalism":—

"1. We demand that churches and other ecclesiastical property shall no longer be exempt from just taxation.

"2. We demand that the employment of chaplains in Congress, in State Legislatures, in the navy and militia, and in prisons, asylums, and all other institutions supported by public money, shall be discontinued.

"3. We demand that all public appropriations for educational and charitable institutions of a sectarian character shall cease.

"4. We demand that all religious services now sustained by the government shall be abolished; and especially that the use of the Bible in the public schools, whether ostensibly as a text-book or avowedly as a book of religious worship, shall be prohibited.

"5. We demand that the appointment, by the President of the United States or by the Governors of the various States, of all religious festivals and fasts shall wholly cease.

"6. We demand that the judicial oath in the courts and in all other departments of the government shall be abolished, and that simple affirmation under the pains and penalties of perjury shall be established in its stead.

"7. We demand that all laws directly or indirectly enforcing the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath shall be repealed.

"8. We demand that all laws looking to the enforcement of 'Christian' morality shall be abrogated, and that all laws shall be conformed to the requirements of natural morality, equal rights, and impartial liberty.

"9. We demand that not only in the Constitutions of the United States and of the several States, but also in the practical administration of the same, no privilege or advantage shall be conceded to Christianity or any other special religion; that our entire political system shall be founded and administered on a purely secular basis; and that whatever changes shall prove necessary to this end shall be consistently, unflinchingly, and promptly made."

These "Demands of Liberalism," originally published in the *Index* (a weekly journal now printed in Boston), on April 6, 1872, have been copied and scattered all over the country through other publications. Early in 1873 "Liberal Leagues" began to be organized on them as a basis of action, and now number at least thirty, and

probably more ; but they have accomplished little in the way of tangible results. In fact, the time is hardly yet arrived for opportunities of efficient action.

Although the actual organization of this party is as yet inconsiderable, no thoughtful man will from this circumstance draw any augury as to its future ; he will rather study closely the principles it represents, and its necessary relation to the issues which, as I have shown, are already compelling the attention of President, Congress, and people. It is absolutely impossible that the religious agitation into which the Catholic attack on the schools has precipitated the people of the United States, should long continue, without calling out from an immense party some powerful affirmation of the fundamental principle which is expressed in the first of the above resolutions. I believe that this party will speedily be a majority of the whole people. Even the Protestant Evangelical party are accustomed to accept this principle verbally ; what is wanted is to convince them of the necessity of its thorough practical application.

Two representative gatherings are to be held in Philadelphia, at the great Centennial Exposition of 1876, which will bring out in bold, dramatic, and almost startling opposition the antagonistic ideas now agitating the nation. The advocates of the Christian Amendment of the Constitution have called a great convention in support of that ominous measure, and will appeal to the now rapidly reviving bigotry of the Protestant party to take the only step which can perpetuate their present power. The advocates of the "Demands of Liberalism" and the "Religious Freedom Amendment," have also called a convention in support of the movement for thorough secularization of the State, and will appeal to the enlightened patriotism of all American citizens to carry out the measures which may be necessary to that great end. The one convention would undo the work of the forefathers, and prevail upon the children to abandon for ever the great principle of the divorce of Church and State, by which the Republic has thus far prospered, in order to restore the antiquated mischief of a State taking its laws from the Church. The other convention would fulfil and perfect the forefathers' work, and prevail upon the children to complete the structure they have inherited, by carrying the same great principle to its consummation in a State whose fundamental law shall be the natural reason and conscience of the people, without a vestige of supernaturalism in its government or administration. In the vast crowd of other interests and excitements, both these conventions may pass comparatively without notice at the time ; but the future student of history may yet point back to them as the negative and positive electrodes of a great battery of moral forces, and note here the first spark of a discharge destined to shake a continent to its foundations.

FRANCIS E. ABBOTT.

## THE WEDDAS.

THE Weddas,<sup>1</sup> or, as they are more commonly but inaccurately called, the Veddas of Ceylon, occupy a portion of the island lying to the east of the hills of the Uva and Medamahanuwara districts, about ninety miles in length and forty in breadth. They have been described by Sir Emerson Tennent in his work on Ceylon,<sup>2</sup> and by Mr. Bailey in a paper printed in the Journal<sup>3</sup> of the Ethnological Society; but, interesting as their accounts are, the latter has suffered grievously from misprints, and the value of the former is impaired by the circumstance that its materials were not the fruit of original research. The excellent works of Dr. Davy, Percival, Cordiner, and others, do not give any full information regarding the Weddas; and the references to them in Knox's history of his captivity, and in the remarkable account of the travels of Ibn Batuta, the Moor, in the early part of the fourteenth century, are curious rather than precise.

The only real division of the Weddas places them in two classes—the Kelé Weddo, or Jungle Weddas; and the Gan Weddo, or semi-civilised Village Weddas; and the attention of the ethnologist should be almost exclusively directed to the former. It may be added that the terms Rock Weddas, Tree Weddas, and Coast Weddas, are unscientific and meaningless, and merely involve a cross division:

The relative numbers of the two classes must be merely a matter of guesswork, for their nomadic habits have rendered any enumeration of them impossible. Sir Emerson Tennent states that their entire number was estimated at eight thousand, but that was a mere conjecture, and probably an exaggerated one. Mr. Bailey, on the other hand, reckoned the total number of Jungle Weddas, in 1858, at three hundred and eighty only, and it is probably less than that at the present time.

He discriminates those which are found in the district of Nilgala from those belonging to a tract of country called Bintenna, but the difference is clearly only geographical, the customs, physical appearance and dialect of the two tribes being precisely identical. Tacit agreement and immemorial use have led them to confine themselves exclusively to particular tracts of the vast extent of forest which

(1) The term signifies "an archer," or "one who shoots," cf. the Sidatsangarawa and the Námávali, wherein the etymology of the word is fully explained. The corresponding Sanskrit term is Vyádha, which Wilson explains to mean "a hunter, or one who lives by killing deer," &c.

(2) "Ceylon," vol. ii. p. 437, et seq.

(3) "Transactions," New Series, vol. ii:

they regard as their prescriptive and inalienable property, and a member of one division of the tribe very rarely comes in contact with another. A gentleman who once witnessed a meeting between some of the members of the two different clans observed that they were mutually embarrassed at the unexpected sight of each other. They peered inquisitively with an expression of mingled suspicion and astonishment, and manifested every disinclination to associate together. A somewhat similar effect was produced when a jungle Wedda was shown a looking-glass. He appeared at first to be terrified and annoyed, but afterwards looked behind it and round about in a puzzled and wondering manner with his hand upon his axe as if preparing to defend himself. Five or six others to whom the glass was successively shown displayed similar gestures, and made use of exactly the same expressions, asking, in a loud and excited tone, the meaning of the strange phenomenon.

The Village Weddas may be differentiated from the others rather by their habits of life than by any physical peculiarities. Their occasional contact with more civilised races has insensibly led them to cultivate land and to construct houses; and during late years an attempt has been made to introduce Christianity and a system of education among them.

The Jungle Weddas, on the other hand, as is well known, have no sort of dwelling-houses, and pass their lives entirely in the open air. They take shelter from a storm under a rock or inside a hollow tree, if one is at hand; and as they are constantly roaming about in their forest country, their manner of life makes it impossible for them to attempt any sort of cultivation. Their food, which they always cook, is very poor. It consists chiefly of honey, iguanas, and talagoyas, or the flesh of the wandura monkey, the deer, and the wild boar, for the supply of which they depend mainly upon their skill with the bow and arrow. They are, however, assisted in their hunting by their dogs, which are called by distinctive names, and are the only domesticated animals which they possess. They drink nothing but water, and, although they habitually chew the bark of certain trees, they never smoke or use tobacco in any way. The tallest Wedda measured by Mr. Bailey was 5 feet 3 inches, and the shortest 4 feet 1 inch. I found one, however, apparently about eighteen years of age, who was 5 feet  $4\frac{3}{4}$  inches. But notwithstanding their small size and their slight physique, the strength which they possess in the arms, and especially in the left arm, is very remarkable. It is probable that this is due to their constant use of the bow, upon which they chiefly depend for their supply of food. It is about 6 feet long, and has generally a pull of from 45 or 48 to about 56 lbs. It therefore requires no ordinary strength to draw the arrow, which is 3 feet 6 inches in length, up to the end; but they



invariably do this, and then take a careful and steady aim before letting it go. The annexed measurements<sup>1</sup> of two Weddas will perhaps show, with more clearness than any general description, the relative dimensions of fairly average specimens of the race. One of them (Latty) was able to hold his bow drawn to its full length for upwards of two minutes, without the slightest tremor of the left arm. They are, as a rule, good shots; and upon one occasion (in February, 1872) I saw a Wedda bring down a Pariah dog at a distance of thirty-five yards when it was running away. He took very deliberate aim, and the arrow passed through nearly the whole length of the animal, entering at the hinder quarter and coming out through the fore shoulder.

Sir Emerson Tennent and Mr. Bailey thought them indifferent marksmen; and the former<sup>2</sup> states that they occasionally use their feet for drawing the bow, but at the present time, at any rate, this practice is entirely unknown, and it is difficult to understand how or why it ever could have existed. They have, in fact, no exceptional prehensile power in their feet, and they are bad climbers. Their bodies are in no way hirsute, nor is there any especial tendency to convergence of the hair towards the elbows, or to divergence from the knees, or *vice versa*.

With the exception of their bows and arrows, their only weapon is a small axe, but there is no trace of the use of any flint or stone implements at any period of their history, although it is observable that the word which they use for axe<sup>3</sup> implies the notion of something made of stone, and in this instance the ethnological value of language is probably shown by the survival in an expression of an idea which would otherwise have long ago been forgotten.

The arrows are made of the wood of the welan tree (*pterospermum suberifolium*) which is also used for the purpose of kindling fire by means of friction, a practice which still has existence amongst them, although they generally have recourse to the flint and steel

(1) *Latty*. Age about 18. Height, 5 feet 4½ inches. From top of forehead to bottom of chin, 6½ inches. Across face 5½ inches. Shoulder to elbow, 11 inches. From elbow to wrist, 10 inches, and on to end of middle finger, 7½ inches. Round biceps of right arm, 10½ inches. Round biceps of left arm, 10¾ inches. Round muscle of right forearm, 8½ inches. Round muscle of left forearm, 8½ inches. Round chest, 31 inches. Length of thigh, 16½ inches. From knee to ankle, 16½ inches. Calf of leg in girth, 11½ inches. Sole of foot, 9½ inches. Round head at the middle of the forehead, 20½ inches.

*Bandiey*. Age about 25. Height, 4 feet 11½ inches. From top of forehead to bottom of chin, 7 inches. Across face, 6½ inches. Shoulder to elbow 12½ inches. From elbow to wrist, 8½ inches, and on to end of middle finger, 6½ inches. Round biceps of right arm, 9½ inches. Round biceps of left arm, 9½ inches. Round muscle of right forearm, 8½ inches. Round muscle of left forearm, 8½ inches. Round chest, 29½ inches. Length of thigh, 16½ inches. From knee to ankle, 15½ inches. Calf of leg in girth, 11½ inches. Sole of foot, 8½ inches. Round head at middle of forehead, 20½ inches.

(2) "Ceylon," vol. i. 499; ii. 439.

(3) *So*. Galrekki, Gala being the Sinhalese word for stone or rock.

by striking the head of their axe or the point of their arrow with some flint substance. They usually obtain their axes and arrow-heads from the Moors who live in the villages adjacent to that part of the country which they inhabit in exchange for hides or beeswax, but the system of secret barter to which Sir Emerson Tennent refers<sup>1</sup> is unknown at the present day. The long iron arrow-heads are similarly obtained from the Moors, and are regarded as heir-looms, descending from father to son and being regarded as possessions of great value by reason of their scarceness, and indeed the arrow not unfrequently consists of merely a sharply-pointed piece of wood with the usual feathers of the wild pea-fowl attached to it.

The general appearance of the Weddas may be described as distinctly non-Aryan. The comparative shortness of their thumbs and their sharply-pointed elbows are worthy of remark, as well as their flat noses and in some cases thick lips, features which at once distinguish them in a marked degree from the oriental races living in their vicinity. Yet their countenances are not absolutely devoid of intelligence, but their coarse flowing hair, their scanty clothing, and their systematic neglect of any kind of ablution present a picture of extreme barbarism. The women wear necklaces and, in common with the men, ornaments in the ears, for which purpose beads are highly valued as well as empty cartridge cases, with which they appear to be greatly pleased, but they have no fondness for bright colours or appreciation of their differences, and it is to be noticed that there is no word in their language for any one of the colours.

They habitually refrain from the use of water except for drinking purposes, upon the ground that the washing of themselves would make them weak, and whilst they speak in an excessively loud and fierce tone of voice, and wear an expression of great unhappiness, it is a remarkable circumstance that they never laugh. They have, nevertheless, that which Juvenal called<sup>2</sup> the finest element in the human character, for they are tender-hearted and can give way to tears. This absence of any disposition to laughter has not been noticed by any one who has yet written upon the Weddas, and it is odd that such a peculiar characteristic should not have been hitherto recorded, for it is a fact well known to the intelligent Sinhalese in the Kandyan districts, and it is certainly deserving of attention. The causes which provoke laughter are doubtless different in different individuals, but every conceivable method for arousing it has been tried upon the Weddas without success, and it was found

(1) "Ceylon," vol. i. 568; vol. ii. 440.

(2) "Mollissima corda  
Humano generi dare se natura fatetur  
Quæ lacrymas dedit; hæc nostri pars optima sensus."—*Sat.* xv. 133.

that the sight of another person laughing produced in them a feeling of unmistakable disgust; upon being asked whether they ever laughed, they replied, "No, why should we? What is there to laugh at?"

There does not seem to be anything in their physical structure or conformation which accounts for this abnormal temperament. It is possible that constant disuse may have caused a certain atrophy and want of power in the muscles of the face which has increased in successive generations, and is analogous to the exceptional development of the strength of the left arm, but from a psychological point of view it may be that their wild habits of life and the total isolation from the rest of the world to which they have been subjected for countless generations have completely deadened in them a susceptibility to external influences, if indeed laughter is exclusively referable to principles of empirical and sensuous nature.

The philosopher Hobbes ascribed it to a feeling of superiority or self-approbation, the result of an act of comparison; and Aristotle seems to have thought that it arose from a sense of something incongruous, unexpected, or sudden.<sup>1</sup> The peculiar test which he mentions was applied to a Wedda, but without success. It may be borne in mind that as a rule all Oriental nations dislike laughter, and that there is no instance of a happy or good-natured laugh recorded in the Bible; and it is noticeable that it is a common practice of the Kandyan Sinhalese to cover their mouth with their hand or to turn away when they laugh, as if they were ashamed. The general subject of laughter has been very fully and ably discussed by Mr. Darwin in his last work, *The Expression of the Emotions*. "It is," he says, "primarily the expression of mere joy or happiness;" and, although the most prevalent and frequent of all the emotional expressions in idiots, it is never to be observed in those who are morose, passionate, or utterly stolid."<sup>2</sup>

Instances have been known in which the muscle, designated *zygomaticus minor*, which is one of those which are more especially brought into play by the act of laughing, has been entirely absent from the anatomical structure of the human face;<sup>3</sup> but it is unlikely that a similar formation should characterize a whole race of people, and no real Wedda has ever yet been subjected to a process of anatomy. An effort was lately made to provoke laughter from five members of the tribe, who are alleged to have been authentic speci-

(1) Διάρι αὐτὸς αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς γαργαλίζει; Ἡ ὅτι καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλου ἡττον ἐὰν προαίσθηται, μᾶλλον δ' ἂν μὴ ὀρεῖ; ὥσθ' ἤιστα γαργαλισθήσεται, ὅταν μὴ λανθάνῃ τοῦτο πάσχων. Ἐστὶ δὲ ὁ γέλως παρακοπή τις καὶ ἀπάτη δι' ὃ καὶ τυπτόμενοι εἰς τὰς φρένας γελῶσιν. οὐ γὰρ ὁ τυχὼν τόπος ἐστὶν ὃ γελῶσιν—τό δὲ λαθροῖον ἀπατητικόν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γίνεται ὁ γέλως καὶ οὐ γίνεται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.—Aristotle, *Problems*, xxxv. 6.

(2) "The Expression of the Emotions," p. 198, and cf. also Βάιν on the "Emotions and the Will," 1866, p. 247.

(3) See Quain's "Anatomy," vol. i. p. 176 (7th edition).

mens of the Jungle Weddas, and who were exhibited to H. R. H. the Prince of Wales on the occasion of his recent visit to Ceylon. They consisted of two men and three women; two of the women were very gentle in appearance, and one is reported to have been decidedly pretty. The two men were described as small and rather ape-like, and are said to have shot fairly well at a mark with their bows and arrows, but "at the command of the missionary," they grinned horribly.

The experiment of attempting to make them laugh under such conditions as these would have been obviously of no value whatever, even if it had been successful.

But the description given of them in the local newspapers and by various special correspondents with some minuteness and diligence leaves no doubt that they were brought from the district of Batticaloa, where the few remaining Weddas, partly owing to the influence of missionaries and partly to frequent intermarriages with Tamils, have lost many of the distinguishing features of their primitive condition. It may be well to observe that it is entirely erroneous to speak of any Weddas as belonging to "a very savage hill tribe," as they were described, probably upon the mistaken idea of an analogy between them and some of the aboriginal tribes of India. The country which they inhabit is low-lying and comparatively flat forest-land, which in no part rises to an elevation of much more than two hundred feet above the sea level, and it is characteristic of none but the village Weddas to live in huts.

A curious and comprehensive memorandum upon the Weddas of the Batticaloa district, furnished by one of the chief native officials in 1872, explains that those which belong to that part of the country generally construct temporary buildings to live in, which are cross-tied with the bark of the Halmilla tree, and roofed with illuk grass, but that they abandon them from time to time when they have occasion to resort elsewhere for food or water. They are designated by Tamil names of Manalkadu, or Sandy-jungle Weddas, and Cholaikkadu Weddas respectively; the former term applying to those who inhabit the country near to the seacoast, cultivating chena lands and speaking the Tamil language; and the latter to those who are nomads, and still retain some of their pristine barbarism; and he bears testimony to the important fact that the wilder and less civilised Weddas of the remote parts of the Bintennio district are an entirely distinct class, and utterly unable to count. It is unfortunate that the representatives of the aboriginal race should have been selected from that portion of the country where they are really found only in name, and that they should have been then subjected to several weeks' training in the art of laughter.

An instance, adduced by Mr. R. Downall, of a Wedda who was

able to laugh remains to be adverted to, particularly as it has given rise to the somewhat hasty generalisation that all jungle Weddas are able to do so heartily. He records that when he was on a shooting expedition a few years ago, he set up his hat as a mark for the Wedda who was acting as his shikari to aim at with his arrows, one evening after his return from the day's shooting. The Wedda at once succeeded in sending an arrow through the hat, and then, it is said, joined in the laugh which was raised against its owner. This evidence, coming, as it does, from a gentleman whose statements are most thoroughly deserving of attention and respect, nevertheless loses much of its value from the absence of any specific information regarding the locality to which the Wedda belonged, and the degree of civilisation to which he had attained. It is, however, clear that he had for some time been associated with the Tamils and others who formed the shooting party; and it is easily conceivable that amidst the general laughter he may have been supposed to have joined, for it was in no way suspected that he would not do so by the gentleman, who naturally kept no record whatever of the occurrence, and wrote from his recollection of the incident some years after it took place.

It may also be mentioned that the Wedda Latty, who has been previously referred to, displayed excessive anger and exhibited a morose expression when he succeeded in hitting the Pariah dog at which he aimed.

Moroseness may indeed be said to be traceable in many of their countenances, no less than in the tones of their voices, but there is no ground for considering it to be really inherent in their character, which is remarkable for kindliness of disposition, and elevated by a universal sentiment of satisfaction with their condition, and a consciousness of superiority to their more civilised neighbours. They would exchange their wild forest life for none other, and it was with the utmost difficulty that they could be induced to quit even for a short time their favourite solitude.

It was an experiment of much interest to observe the effect produced by each successive object as it made its impression for the first time upon their minds, untaught as they were by previous experience of anything besides the mere phenomena of nature. A party of five were upon the first occasion simultaneously brought from their forests. The sight of a brick-built house surprised them, but the first wheeled vehicle they saw filled them with alarm and terror, and as they bent eagerly forward to scrutinize it they instinctively grasped the handles of their axes. The various articles of food which were offered to them were unhesitatingly rejected, and they were with difficulty persuaded at length to eat boiled rice, which they at first seemed to fear would make them intoxicated or stupefied. After a time, however, they became fond of it and eat it

in large quantities with a considerable admixture of salt, with which they expressed themselves highly gratified. They declared that the taste of salt was entirely new to them, and upon their return to their forests they expressly asked that they might be allowed to carry with them in preference to anything else as large a supply as they could transport. A similar taste was subsequently shown by other parties of jungle Weddas both in their forests and also when they were brought away for purposes of observation and inquiry.

Tobacco, which the Village Weddas occasionally use, was contemptuously refused by the jungle Weddas, who called it merely "dry leaves," and betel, and other favourite narcotics of the Sinhalese people were persistently declined.

The intellectual capacity of the Weddas is as low as it can possibly be in any persons endowed with reason. They are wholly unable to count or to comprehend the significance of number; they have no words to denote the ideas of one, or two, or three, nor do they even use their fingers for this purpose; and the chief difficulty in obtaining any information from them arose from their inability to form any but the most simple mental synthesis, and from their very defective power of memory. One of them, called Kôwy, had entirely forgotten the names of his father and of his mother, who were both dead, and only recollected the name of his wife, whom he had seen only three days previously, by a great effort, and after a long interval of consideration.

There is an interesting account given in an appendix to a report by Mr. Green upon the Welikada convict establishment, of a Wedda who had been tried for murder, and had received a commutation of his capital sentence to imprisonment with hard labour in chains. Mr. Green considered him to be a village Wedda, and it was found, on his admission into the jail, that he was able to count six. A native newspaper, called the *Lanka Nilhâna*, contained a report of his trial, in which he was described as "a Wedda, or wild man," and it appeared that he had killed another Wedda because he believed that he had destroyed two of his dogs by means of witchcraft. He was found guilty of murder, but the jury prayed for mercy towards him, as he was as ignorant as a beast. The force of this reason became apparent when, after regularly attending the prison school for three months, he had only succeeded in learning nine letters of the Sinhalese alphabet, and extending his knowledge of numbers to counting eighteen. He had no idea of a soul, of a Supreme Being, or of a future state. He thought there was no existence after death; he was conscious of no difference between himself and the wild beasts which roamed through the forest; and the only thing which he knew for certain was that the sun rose in the morning, and in the evening the darkness came on. He had, however, heard some one speak of a

Superior Being, called Wallyhami, but could not say whether it was a god or a devil, a good or an evil spirit; he was not afraid of it, nor did he pray to it. It seems probable that he was in this instance alluding to the deity Skanda, the Hindu personification of Ares (*Ἄρης*), known in Ceylon as Kandaswāmi, who, according to the Sinhalese myth, married a Wedda princess named Walli Amma, under whose peculiar care the Weddas were in consequence assumed to be placed.

It appeared from an ola, or book consisting of palm-leaves, inscribed by a stilus, which was in the possession of one of the Kandyan chiefs, that this personage was the offspring of Vishnu. The ola, which bears no date, nor the name of its author, states that the celebrated temple known as the Kataragama Dewale was built by the famous Sinhalese king, Dutugemunu, the conqueror of the Tamils, who reigned B.C. 160, and who appointed the Weddas as servants of the god on account of the purity of their caste. The princess, having been miraculously born, was discovered by the Weddas in their hunting excursions and grew up under their care. She became remarkable for her beauty and her charms, and captivated the god Skanda, to whom the Kataragama temple was dedicated. He assumed the disguise of a religious Ascetic, and offered her his hand, which she indignantly refused. The god thereupon went to his brother Ganesa, the god of wisdom, and asked for his assistance, which he at once lent by taking the form of a huge elephant and frightening the maiden. She fled for help to her rejected suitor, who after much entreaty, consented to protect her on condition that she became his wife. She agreed and went with him, but the Weddas chased after them and shot at them with their arrows which fell at their feet without effect. He then discharged an arrow at the Weddas and thousands of them fell dead on the spot, but upon the intercession of the damsel, the god, reassuming his proper form, restored them to life, and then married her under the name of Walli Amma.

The merest outlines of this tradition are utterly unknown to the jungle Weddas, and it is doubtful whether many of them had ever heard even the name of the tutelary deity, who represented to the unfortunate prisoner above referred to little more than the principle and personification of the unknown.

Although it is probable that he belonged to the class of Village Weddas, it would appear from the statements which he made, that he was thoroughly conversant with the customs and ideas of the more barbarous Jungle Weddas, and indeed it is not unlikely that he was an instance of a member of the latter class who had by some means become degenerated into the former. His slight knowledge of numbers was evidently due to the efforts of missionaries or other

persons who endeavoured shortly before the time of his imprisonment to educate his people. It would perhaps be unfair to attribute to a similar influence the commission of the act of violence which resulted in his trial for murder; but it is worthy of consideration whether the condition of a race barbarous indeed, but nevertheless rejoicing in a complete and long-established immunity from crime, is likely to be enlightened by the benefits of western morality and civilisation.

He seems to have been considerably expert in the use of the bow and arrows, having frequently killed as many as half-a-dozen deer in a day, and upon two occasions an elephant; but when he made trial of his skill with those weapons in the prison he was somewhat unsuccessful. He accounted for his failure by his want of practice with a bow and arrows new and strange to him, and his extreme weakness consequent upon an attack of dysentery; when he was prostrated by this disorder he refused all sort of nourishment and his recovery was attributed in a great measure to his entire abstinence from food. He continually made piteous appeals to go to his wife and children, and to be taken from the prison where there was so much light and heat and glare to some place where he could lie under the shade of trees and green leaves. It is gratifying to be able to add, that owing to the kind and humane consideration of His Excellency Lord Torrington, the governor, he was released after a short period of incarceration.

The diseases from which all Weddas more particularly suffer are dysentery and fever; and it would seem that the effects of the former have been from time to time exceedingly disastrous. The remedies which they adopt for it, consist in pounding the astringent bark of certain trees which they generally use for chewing and mixing the juice with water which they then drink. In cases of fever they drink warm water, as is the very general custom of the Sinhalese people, and also pour it over the body. Their only surgical implement is the sharp blade of the long spearlike arrow-head, and this is used in cases of midwifery, wherein the husband is alone the operator.

Far from exhibiting any tendency to Pantheistic or the simpler forms of nature worship, as some writers have supposed, the jungle Weddas appear to be almost devoid of any sentiment of religion; they are not even acquainted with the name of Buddha, or the theory of metempsychosis; they have no temples, priests, festivals, or games, but their belief is limited by the notion that after death they become *yakko*, or devils, and herein may be traced their unquestioned identity with the Autochthones, of whom an account is given in the ancient chronicles of Ceylon.<sup>1</sup> When one of them dies, the body is wrapped in the hide of a deer, if such a thing be at the time pro-

<sup>1</sup> (1) Cf. "The Mahawanso," ch. vii.



curable, and a grave is dug with their hatchets and with pointed sticks. This service is performed exclusively by the males, no female being ever present on such an occasion; nothing is put into the grave with the body, and after it has been covered over, the spot where it lies, apparently from mingled motives of fear and sorrow, is never revisited. An offering is then made to the departed spirit which has become a devil, in order that it may not torment the survivors with fever; it consists of the flesh of the wandura, or monkey, and the talagoya, added to a quantity of honey and some esculent roots, which are all roasted together, while the senior member of the family of the deceased repeats the simple formula, "Malagi etto topan me kewili lapaw," or, "Ye dead persons, take ye these food offerings," and then divides the whole of it amongst himself and those who are present, by whom it is eaten. In this custom there may possibly be traced the faint germs of a religion; and it is of peculiar ethnological significance if, as has been maintained, the earliest form which religion took consisted in the propitiation of the spirits of deceased ancestors.

The moral characteristics of the Weddas exhibit, as may be supposed, the simplest workings of the unreflecting and subjective will, not regulated by law nor conditioned by experience. They think it perfectly inconceivable that any person should ever take that which does not belong to him, or strike his fellow, or say anything that is untrue. The practice of polygamy and polyandry which still exists to some extent amongst their neighbours, the Sinhalese, is to them entirely unknown. Marriage is, nevertheless, allowed with sisters and with daughters, but never with the eldest sister, and in all cases they are remarkable for constancy to their wives and affection for their children. The practice of marrying sisters is not yet extinct, as Mr. Bailey supposed, amongst the Weddas of Bintenna, for in the year 1872 there was a living instance in the person of one named Wanniya, who had married his sister Latti; he was about twenty years of age, and had one child. It appeared that no one but Wanniya himself, and not even his brother, was ever allowed to go near his wife or child, or to supply them with any food.

A marriage is attended with no ceremony beyond the presentation of some food to the parents of the bride, who is not herself allowed the exercise of any choice in the selection of her husband, and in this respect, as in some others, the subjection of women is complete. A woman is never recognised as the head of a family, nor is she admitted to any participation in the ceremony attending the offering made to the spirits of the dead. The eldest male Wedda is regarded with a sort of patriarchal respect when accident or occasion has brought together any others than the members of one family, but all the rest are considered as equals, and the distinctions of caste are

not known. The Kandians universally agree that they all belong to the royal caste, and it is said that they used to address the king by the now obsolete title "Hura," or cousin, the term which they applied to myself in conversation.

Their language is a subject which demanded the most particular care and attention, but I reserve for the present any full account of it. It unfortunately possesses no written characters, and, owing to its limited vocabulary, which embraces merely the most elementary concepts, as well as to the difficulty of communicating with people so singularly unintelligent as the Weddas, the results which have been obtained may perhaps not be considered thoroughly conclusive or satisfactory. Their charms or folk-lore show a resemblance to Eln, but they are extremely difficult to translate, and their precise object and signification is for the most part undefined. The list of proper names contains, as Mr. Bailey has observed, some which are in use among the Sinhalese, but high caste and low caste names are indiscriminately jumbled together; others are names common to Tamils, while a large number are entirely unknown to Sinhalese or Tamils, and of these a portion are in common use in Bengal, and belong to Hindu deities or personages mentioned in the Purānas. Besides the words which indicate an affinity with Sinhalese, there are others which are allied with Pali and with Sanskrit, and an important residue of doubtful origin; but it is worthy of remark that from beginning to end the vocabulary is characterized by an absence of any distinctly Dravidian element, and that it appears to bear no resemblance whatever to the language spoken by the Yakkas of East Nipal. A similarity may indeed be traced here and there between a Wedda word and the equivalent for the same idea in modern Tamil, Malayalam, or Telegu, but the cases in which comparison is possible are so rare that these apparent coincidences may be fairly considered to be merely fortuitous. The signs of a grammatical structure are too faint to justify any inferences of comparative philological value, and upon an examination of those words which may be said to constitute the most fundamental and necessary portion of a language, no special conclusion is to be drawn. But an analysis or consideration of the Wedda language may be more fitly postponed than dealt with at present, especially as the value of linguistic evidence is but slight in the determination of ethnological questions. Attention may, however, be drawn to the circumstance which has been pointed out by Mr. Tylor,<sup>1</sup> and which invests the subject with peculiar interest, that the Weddas are the only savage race in existence speaking an Aryan language, for such it undoubtedly is, although the people can in no sense be classified ethnologically as Aryans themselves.

BERTRAM F. HARTSHORNE.

(1) *Journal of the Ethnological Society*, April, 1870.

## ON EXAMINATIONS.

TWENTY years ago, the system of examinations had, perhaps, reached the acme of its popularity. Several of the most distinguished men in parliament, at the bar, in the church, in literature, in almost every walk of public life, were pointed to as examples of its success, and of the power of discrimination possessed by those who administered it. Senior wranglers were on the bench; First-classmen constituted a large proportion of the cabinet; the most eminent scholars and writers were, to a large extent, the same with those who had attained the highest places in the examinations of the universities. Hence, not unnaturally, it was thought that a system which had produced such results, and had been worked, as it confessedly had been worked, with so much impartiality and judgment, might be extended and elaborated to the great advantage both of learning and of the public service. It was about this time, that the old system of nomination was abolished in the Indian Civil Service, and it was determined that the future administrators of India should be appointed according to the results of a competitive examination. A similar arrangement, with some important modifications, was soon afterwards extended to the government offices at home. About the same time, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were being re-organized by Parliamentary Commissions, and, in Oxford, at least, the examination system acquired additional importance by being applied with far more stringency than previously to the elections for fellowships. Many students, who would formerly have been content with the ordinary degree, were also encouraged to read for honours by the institution of new class-lists or triposes.

Most persons who are competent to form an opinion, seem to be agreed that the public services, both at home and in India, have gained by the substitution, wholly or partially, of a system<sup>1</sup> of

(1) "Until the year 1855 admission into the Civil Service was purely a matter of patronage. No examination, either test or competitive, was required. A candidate was appointed because he was the younger son of a peer, or the son of one who had been useful in electioneering matters; whilst the inferior appointments—such as the Customs, Excise, and Revenue departments—were the perquisites of respectable butlers and footmen of the nobility. In fact, the Civil Service was regarded by that influential minority, the 'Upper Ten Thousand,' as a comfortable house of refuge, supported by the nation for their poor relations or dependents. The result can easily be imagined; the condition of the home service was as unsatisfactory as possible. Complaints daily arose of the inefficiency of the officials. Men high up in office were often found incapable of writing a letter without grammatical and orthographical mistakes. The time of the public was wasted, and their patience exhausted by useless red tape machinery. Heads of offices came late and went away early, and their example was followed by the junior clerks. A government office was regarded by the public mind as a place in

examination for the old system of nomination. There are probably, also, not many persons conversant with the University of Oxford,<sup>1</sup> during the last five-and-twenty or thirty years, who would deny that, taking the colleges in the aggregate, and speaking generally, the quality of the common-rooms, and the efficiency of the educational staff have been improved by the substitution of the present system of election for the varied, and often not wholly unselfish, considerations which used at one time to determine the choice of the electors. Speaking plainly, purity of election has, in the case of the Oxford Fellowships, been, at least, one result of the application of the examination system, and this is a result which no one acquainted with the previous condition of Oxford ought to underestimate.

It cannot be denied, however, that the extension and consequent elaboration of examinations has led, incidentally, to many grave evils, and all who are interested in education and learning ought to be grateful to writers, like Mr. Pattison and Mr. Sayce, who have unsparingly exposed these evils, even though they may have exaggerated their intensity, or failed to recognise what others will regard as counterbalancing advantages. Thus, there can be no doubt that examinations hamper the freedom of the teacher; in order to secure the attention of his pupils, he must lecture on such subjects, and in such a manner, as will be remunerative in the examinations. Again, they often prevent the pupil from following his natural bent, or induce a mechanical style of reading which is injurious to his highest intellectual development. And, though, at first sight, it might appear as if the examination system would, at all events, promote thoroughness, it unfortunately has too frequently the opposite effect of encouraging superficiality; it does not "pay" to pursue a subject beyond a certain point. General views and minute facts alike admit of being "crammed." Examiners, after all, being but fallible men, the show of knowledge is often mistaken for the reality. Style often counts for more than matter, cleverness for more than depth, a vague acquaintance with many subjects for more than a scientific knowledge of one.

So great are these evils, that if all students were inspired by an ardent love of knowledge, and all who nominate to offices were actuated by a simple desire to find the best man, and had also ample opportunities of discovering him, we might well be content to

which the officials read the papers, wrote private letters at her Majesty's expence, and attended to everything but what they were paid for—their business."—Ewald's "Guide to the Civil Service," pp. 1, 2.

(1) In the University of Cambridge Fellowships had been awarded by examination long before this became the rule in the University of Oxford. At Trinity they were awarded mainly by the results of an examination conducted by the college itself; at other colleges by the results of the University Triposes.

see the abolition of the examination system. We might say emphatically and truly that it has been tried, and found wanting. But, as we are not living in an ideal world, but one in which exertion is constantly requiring stimulus, and faults and abuses are constantly crying for remedies, it may be worth while to ask what would be the consequences if the stimulus and protection of examinations were suddenly withdrawn. Should we be content to see the old system of nomination re-introduced into all branches of the public service? Should we be content to see the fellowships in our colleges filled up according to their pleasure by small and irresponsible bodies, without the possibility of any appeal to public opinion? Should we be content to see the great mass of youths who throng our universities and public schools, subject to no restraint but the obligation to attend lectures, or left absolutely to select their own subjects and method of study, and, in fact, to determine for themselves whether they would study at all or not? To the two first of these questions, it may, of course, be replied that we may trust men to select the best servants or the best colleagues, as the case may be. But have they, when unchecked, done so in time past, and is there any reason to suppose that they are more likely to do so in the time to come? Nor is it easy to see how an obscure youth, without interest or connections, is, under ordinary circumstances, to make himself known to the dispensers of patronage by any other means than success in a competitive examination. To the last of these questions, it will probably be replied that the young men whom I have mainly in view, as requiring the stimulus of an examination, ought not to frequent the universities at all; that the universities ought to be confined to genuine students, who come for no other object than the pursuit of some branch of literature or science. This is an ideal which, perhaps, might be desirable; but there can be no question that in a practical country, like ours, the universities will always be expected to provide a liberal education, not for specialists only and future professors, but for future clergymen, schoolmasters, lawyers, statesmen, and, generally, for men who are to take a part in the affairs of life. Here we have a consideration which, as it appears to me, many of our more recent academical reformers have left altogether out of their calculation, but which they must undoubtedly take account of, if their schemes are to find any acceptance with those who will have the power of giving effect to them. Our universities ought, undoubtedly, to be "Solomon's houses," places where knowledge is being not only assimilated but advanced; but they must, whether they will it or not, continue to be places of general education as well, providing their "due supply" of men serviceable "in Church and State." Now for the average class of students, it seems to me that some kind of examination (for the old "disputations," while they

remained a reality, were only another form of examination) is indispensable, both as a guide to the subjects of study, and as a stimulus to their pursuit.

While, therefore, sharing to a considerable extent in the views of those who see great evils in the present system of examinations, I cannot go to the length of proposing its abolition. I prefer asking whether there are no remedies which may at least alleviate, if they cannot altogether remove, the disadvantages which appear to be incident to it. The suggestions which I am about to throw out are the result of some experience in the work of examining both in Oxford and elsewhere; but I propose them rather tentatively than with any confidence that I have solved the difficulties of what is perhaps the most difficult question in the whole theory of intellectual education.

I. I would suggest then that, at present, we apply the test of examinations both at too early and at too late an age. The new system of awarding scholarships at schools by competitive examination, though it undoubtedly has some advantages, has acted in the way of putting an undue strain on the mental faculties of boys at too early an age. Parents, who value the distinction, or to whom the pecuniary assistance is of great moment, are compelled to subject their sons to an elaborate and often costly education commencing almost in infancy. The result can hardly fail to be to repress the spontaneity and freshness which, if not developed in early years, are seldom developed at all, and (a most serious moral consideration) prematurely and often most unduly to stimulate the feelings of ambition and emulation. Boys, I believe, may compete for foundation scholarships at most of the great public schools up to the age of fourteen, but they are eligible at the age of eleven, and it is, of course, to the interest of the father that they should obtain these scholarships at the earliest opportunity; moreover, the time of preparation must commence some time before the actual competition. A boy, then, under ordinary circumstances, will be subjected at the age of eight or nine to a definite and systematic training for the purpose of competing with other boys, three or four years hence, in what is, for him, at his age, a stiff and searching examination, while he will be told by his parents that his future career in life will mainly depend upon his success. Thus, learning is associated from his earliest years with the prospect of pecuniary gain and social distinction. Can we wonder if the next generation of young Englishmen is portentously ambitious, portentously grasping, and portentously stupid? To suggest a remedy is very difficult, but it certainly occurs to one to ask if it is desirable to fill up foundation scholarships in this manner? Or, if it is desirable, might not the age of admission be raised to, say, from thirteen to fifteen? But to me, I must confess, the whole system of competitive examinations for small boys appears

to be radically vicious. The sons of poor parents have gained little, if anything, by it. A man, who is really poor, cannot afford to send his son to an expensive preparatory school, and it may be questioned whether the whole amount of money spent on the extra preparation of the candidates, successful and unsuccessful, who compete for the scholarships, does not far exceed the pecuniary value of the prizes. I am not ashamed to confess myself one of those retrograde persons who regard the institution of these scholarships, or at least the opening of them to general competition, as but a very inadequate compensation to the poorer professional and trading classes for the increased charges for day-scholars at the public schools and for the abolition or reduction to the "second grade" of so many of the smaller grammar-schools, in which their sons could previously obtain a free or very inexpensive education.

But, whatever doubt there may be as to the expediency of examining boys (or rather children) between the ages of eleven and fourteen, I think that there will be few who, on reflection, will maintain that preparation for a competitive examination is a desirable employment for young men who have attained the age of three or four-and-twenty. And yet this is the age at which, to say nothing of the examinations for Fellowships, many of the students at the universities now become candidates for honours. Just at the time when a man ought to have discovered his natural bent, and to be following it, he is fettered by the inexorable requirements of an examination. If he has made up his mind to follow some practical profession, it would be far better that he should already have embarked in it; for "art is long, and life is short," and the gifts which lead to practical success and efficiency are not easily or speedily acquired. But if, on the other hand, he is really interested in some branch of study, and prepared to devote the whole or a large portion of his time to it, what he requires above all things is freedom; freedom to select this or that particular department of the subject for special investigation, freedom in his method of inquiry, freedom in arriving at his results. Advice and instruction, indeed, he may still require, and this is precisely what to a student of this age an university ought to afford; but dictation as to the subjects of study and the mode of studying he does not want, though it is just this kind of dictation to which, if he is preparing for a competitive examination, he must inevitably submit. Dictation, or peremptory guidance, of this kind is, I believe, often invaluable to the younger student: it compels him to follow a course of study, very useful or even indispensable to him, which he would find too irksome to follow of his own accord; it often introduces him to new subjects, and excites dormant interests; lastly, with its sanctions of distinction and reward, it supplies an incentive to serious study

which few well-to-do English youths of nineteen or twenty, with their multitudinous opportunities of enjoyment, could well dispense with. I arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that, while competitive examinations, if not a necessary, are at least a desirable adjunct of education, the age of preparation for them is at present extended beyond due limits, with an ever-increasing tendency, be it added, to still further extension. It ought, I think, to cease at about the age of one-and-twenty. Now this is merely a matter of legislation for the schools and the universities. Boys should leave school at eighteen (they now frequently do not leave till twenty), and the university course for the Bachelor's degree should, in all cases, be limited to three years.<sup>1</sup> Besides having the effect of cutting short the period of preparation for examinations, and thus limiting them to what I conceive to be their proper objects, this change would be attended with many other advantages. It would enable the ordinary student to enter earlier on his professional career. It would enable the professed student to devote himself at an earlier age to the free and unrestricted pursuit of his special study. By liberating this latter class from the control of the examinations, it would probably vastly increase the matured study, the genuine spirit of research, and the true scientific interest which even the most favourable critics of the universities now deplore as so largely wanting. Moreover, a change such as I have suggested would go a long way towards solving the question of discipline, which, for many years past, has been the torment of college tutors. If the undergraduate came up at an earlier age, and took his degree in a shorter time, than at present, the university and colleges might insist on a far more stringent system of discipline than now, when there is so large an infusion of men of mature age to whom it is almost impossible to apply any strict system of rules, and whose exemption almost necessarily leads to the exemption of others. A distinct line of demarcation might be drawn between the young undergraduate, who was reading for his degree, and who would be subject to definite disciplinary rules, and the bachelor who was remaining in the university for the purposes of special study, and would simply be expected to conduct himself as a respectable citizen conducts himself elsewhere. In fact, the termination of the legal nonage would as nearly as possible coincide with the termination of the academical

(1) These remarks refer mainly to the University of Oxford. At both universities, the average duration of the course for a Pass Degree is a good deal shorter than that for honours. At Cambridge, the honours' course does not exceed three and a quarter, or three and a half years; but I believe that the undergraduates, at least those who are likely to be candidates for mathematical honours, go up at rather a later age than at Oxford. In Oxford, the limit of standing for honours (and the candidate almost always avails himself of his last chance) is, by a recent regulation, the sixteenth term (the end of the fourth year), but by taking an honour in some other subject, even though it be only a fourth class, the candidate can defer his principal examination to his twentieth term (the end of the fifth year).



nonage, and in this way, I think, many minor difficulties of college and university government would be solved.

It will be observed that, though I propose that the B.A. degree should be taken at an earlier age than, at present, I contemplate the probability of a considerable number of graduates continuing their studies in the universities. These would form the advanced classes of the professors, and would, it is to be hoped, set an example of diligent and earnest intellectual effort to the younger students.

One undoubted advantage which would result from the Bachelor's degree being commonly taken at an earlier age than at present, would be that less value would be attached, than is now the case, to the class-lists and triposes. The desire to gain academical distinction is now often far too absorbing, and often completely overpowers the more generous desire to gain knowledge and intellectual aptitude. Hence, one of the causes why it has come to be thought that the main, if not the sole, function of a teacher in Oxford is to prepare his pupils for examination. These considerations, however, lead me to my second remedy.

II. The honours awarded on the result of a competitive examination, should not be too nicely differentiated. The attempt at an absolute arrangement by merit in the Cambridge triposes, and even the four classes of the Oxford class-lists, appear to me to offer too powerful an incentive to youthful ambition. The prospect of the first place or the first-class must often tempt a man to read far beyond his strength, and, any way, tends to concentrate his attention far too exclusively on the subjects of his examination. The student, I hold (and this I believe to be a most important point in the discussion of the present question), should always have a portion of his time free for intellectual occupations which are not covered by the examinations for which he is preparing; otherwise he is apt to acquire a slavish and mechanical habit of study, always reading with an end in view, and never for the pleasure of the occupation. Now a tripos or class-list with two classes, within which the candidates were arranged alphabetically, might, I think, furnish the requisite stimulus to industry without unduly straining the student's powers or too exclusively occupying his attention. This curtailment of the glories of the class-list might also have the advantage of diminishing the competition amongst colleges, of which I shall have to speak presently. Of course, the evils of competition would not be wholly removed by the plan which I suggest, but they would undoubtedly be considerably diminished. And if it be objected that they would re-appear in the competition for fellowships and university scholarships, I reply in the first place, that this is not likely to affect nearly so large a number of men; and, in the second place, that the nature of examinations for these prizes does not nearly to the same extent as that for the schools, control

the reading of the students. Moreover, under any future scheme of university reform, the fellowships awarded by competitive examination are likely to be much fewer than at present. I may suggest also as well worth the consideration of colleges generally a plan which has been found to work well at Trinity College, Cambridge, that of requiring or encouraging candidates for fellowships to send in Dissertations representing research or original work. The Dissertations would, of course, be only complementary to the examination; but they would furnish a very useful correction of the cram, superficiality, and mere cleverness, which examinations unless most carefully conducted, are always in danger of encouraging.

III. Every examiner should, if possible, see the whole work of the candidates, and the various examiners should have an opportunity of comparing their results and impressions. This rule, frequently as it is neglected, seems almost essential to forming an equitable estimate of the candidate's capacities and acquirements. It is not necessary that each examiner should pay the same amount of attention to each department of the work, but he ought to be acquainted with its general quality and its principal excellences and defects. When the object of the examination is the selection of persons for the purpose of performing specific duties, this rule becomes doubly important. Yet in the examinations for the public service, where this is the one object in view, it is systematically, though perhaps unavoidably, contravened. It might, however, deserve consideration, whether, even at the risk of sacrificing some of the subjects and options in these examinations, this rule, or some modification of it, might not be introduced. Probably no college in Oxford or Cambridge would consent to elect a Fellow simply by adding up marks contributed by different examiners, without requiring any conference as to his general attainments and qualifications, and it is difficult to suppose that the efficiency of the public service does not suffer by the present system. Even in Oxford, the increasing tendency of the examiners to divide the work amongst them, instead of holding themselves severally responsible for it all, though due, no doubt, to the increasing number of candidates, has probably had an unfavourable influence both on the character of the questions and on the results of the examinations.

IV. It hardly needs to be remarked that the reading and thought of the student must necessarily be affected to a great extent by the character of the questions ordinarily set in the examinations for which he is preparing, and still this is a consideration which examiners, in framing their questions, appear to be very apt to overlook. A student reading a book in which he is about to be examined, is apt to read it exclusively with a view to the questions likely to be set, and this, perhaps, is one of the greatest evils resulting from the examination system. Now, if the questions are very

vague or wide, he naturally reads his book very superficially; in fact, it is hardly necessary that he should read it at all, and for examination purposes, the notes of his tutor's lectures may be more than an equivalent for any amount of patient study on his own part. On the other hand, if the questions are exceedingly minute, or, as sometimes happens, turn on curious and recondite points which might easily escape the notice of even a patient reader, the student has to "get up" his book in a slavish and repulsive fashion, which is very likely to deaden his interest in that particular subject, if not in science and literature generally. And here again, he is not unlikely to substitute for his own reading (and little can we blame him for doing so!) the services of a "coach," who is acquainted, in undergraduate language, with the "tips." Hence, the great importance of selecting questions which will at once serve the purpose of pointing out to the student the proper method of reading a book and of insuring that he does read it. Questions of an intermediate kind between the most general and the most minute are usually the best for this purpose, and when a book has become so trite that it is difficult to find new questions of this character, it is better either to set the old questions over again, or to change the book, rather than to change the mode of examination. What I have said of examination in books applies, of course, *mutatis mutandis*, to examination in subjects.

V. Not the least difficulty connected with examinations consists in finding the right examiner. The ideal arrangement would seem to be that the teacher, if he is a good one, should examine his own pupils. In this way, the examinations would be subordinated to the teaching, as they ought to be, and not the teaching, as is too often the case, to the examinations. In schools and small universities, this arrangement may approximately be carried out, but in the competitive examinations for the Civil Service and in our large English universities it is out of the question. Whether the arrangement which now practically exists in our universities, according to which a small number of the teachers examine their own pupils and those of all the others, is a desirable, or, at least, the most desirable arrangement, admits, I think, of much doubt. When a large part of the examination consists of question-papers, and especially when some of them are on subjects as distinguished from books, I own I cannot see how the pupil can fail to derive some advantage from having his tutor on the board of examiners. Of conscious, or even unconscious, partiality no one would dream of accusing an Oxford or Cambridge examiner, but the pupil is at all times sufficiently acquainted with his tutor's idiosyncrasies, and, when his tutor is also his examiner, he can hardly be expected to refrain from studying these idiosyncrasies with special interest and attention, and considering how they are likely to reflect themselves in the papers of questions. Nor can

an examiner, even if he is perfectly just towards opinions and methods of teaching different from his own, prevent others from entertaining the contrary expectation. Hence, the somewhat unbecoming anxiety with which nominations to the examinerships are watched in Oxford both by tutors and undergraduates. It is not easy to suggest a remedy for this evil, for, outside the circle of teachers, it would generally be difficult to find persons at once sufficiently acquainted with the work and sufficiently interested in the welfare of the universities to take upon themselves what is always a very onerous, and often a very thankless office. It might, however, be an improvement on the present system of appointment, if there were a larger infusion of examiners not directly engaged in the teaching, whenever the services of competent persons of this class could be secured ; and, perhaps, it might be worth trying whether the appointment of examiners from time to time, instead of for periods of office as at present, and the withholding as long as practicable of their names from those interested in knowing them, might not have the effect of making the preparation of the candidates less dependent on the character and views, known or supposed, of those who were to estimate their merits. This, it may be remarked, is already the plan adopted in the nomination of examiners for the Civil Service. But many are of opinion that there is no real remedy for this and other evils connected with the Oxford examinations, but the excision from them of disputable matter, in other words, of recent philosophy. In some respects, this would undoubtedly be a great loss, and yet it must be confessed that this element has intruded unduly on the older subjects of examination and brought with it many unforeseen consequences from which we would gladly free ourselves. Much that Mr. Pattison has said on this subject both in his work on "Academical Organization," and in his recent Article in "Mind," appears to me exaggerated, but at the same time I cannot but feel that there is an ugly truth at the bottom of it. The examinations in Oxford dominate the teaching, and it would certainly be difficult to defend the teaching, at all points, from the charges of superficiality and sophistry. A healthier tone, it seems to me, might be restored by reducing the examinations, as I have suggested at the beginning of this article, to humbler proportions. An examination designed for students of one-and-twenty after three years' residence, and offering only two classes in honours, would necessarily present a less ambitious programme than the one which Mr. Pattison has recently criticised. This would be a measure of relief both to tutors and pupils, and would result, I believe, not in less work being done than at present, but in the work done being sounder, freer, more thorough, and more lasting.

I have left myself but little space for considering the effects of the examination system upon the teachers, and in the few remarks which

I am about to make, I must, consequently, confine myself to Oxford. It is undoubtedly true, as we are now frequently told, that the Oxford tutor has become the slave of the examinations, that he has little time for his own studies, and, as a natural result, that his intellectual stock of facts and ideas is often (though to this there are many conspicuous exceptions) not much greater than that which he imparts to his pupils. He has long ceased to enjoy the *otium cum dignitate*, which was the good fortune of his predecessors, and which is still popularly associated with his position. But how has this change come about; for it has not yet, I believe, taken place at Cambridge, where the examinations are, perhaps, a more absorbing element in university life than even in Oxford? It is due to a concurrence of several circumstances which it would be tedious and beyond my present purpose to enumerate; but chief among these, doubtless, are the zeal and sense of duty which, in recent times, have inspired successive generations of tutors, impelling them to sacrifice their time, and, in many cases, their prospects to the interests of their pupils. The college tutor, in fact, some years ago, voluntarily super-added the functions of the private tutor to his own. This may have been a mistaken course, and mistaken in the tutor's own interests it undoubtedly was, but at least it demands sympathy and admiration, even though, in some respects, the consequences may have been of doubtful service to learning and education. The tradition, however, having once been created, cannot be suddenly changed. The college tutor cannot now bid the undergraduates betake themselves to private tutors, and say that his time is too valuable to spend upon preparing them for examinations. But still he need not despair of relief, though the relief may be distant, and though, perhaps, it may entail many unexpected changes in the present system of instruction. The fact is that the individual attention paid to undergraduates reading for honours is often far in excess of what is really good for them, and is due to unhealthy conditions of university life which, it is to be hoped, are not permanent. It is due partly to the present examination system, which demands knowledge, or rather a show of knowledge, greatly in excess of what the student can reasonably be expected to gain from books and his own study; but it is due, I conceive, in a far greater degree, to the unwholesome and pernicious competition which exists amongst colleges. This competition compels the tutor to look not to the intellectual improvement of his pupil, but to his chances of a class. Success in the class-list has come to be the one test of a tutor's efficiency and the one end of his exertions. A "good college" is, in popular estimation, a college which turns out a number of first-classmen, without any regard, by the way, to the advantage which it may originally have had in the material supplied to it by the schools. Now this state of things will last, and must, I think, last, while the higher teaching is mainly in

the hands of the colleges as distinguished from the university. Transfer the teaching of the higher classes of undergraduates from college to university officers, as proposed by Professor Bonamy Price in his lately published pamphlet, and, under a somewhat different form, by myself and others in evidence given before the Committee of the House of Commons on Mr. Ewart's Bill, and again before the more recent Scientific Commission, and I believe that it will at once be emancipated from its present servile subjection to the examination schools; that, while the students gain in manliness and self-reliance, the teachers will obtain more leisure for their own pursuits, and be able to place before themselves and their pupils nobler aims, and a more exalted standard of knowledge than is possible under the present circumstances of keen and incessant competition. The distinctions of the class-lists, under such a system, might possibly come to be less prized; but knowledge and true education would undoubtedly be advanced by it.

Let the forthcoming Commission address itself to two problems, the absorption, at least for the purposes of the higher teaching, in one great university of the five-and-twenty small universities which now exist in Oxford, and the provision of a career for the teachers, which shall enable them to regard Oxford as their permanent home; and I doubt not that it will create an asylum for education, literature, and science, of which the nation, in future years, will have no occasion to be ashamed. When the preponderating motive in the mind of the teacher is, and, from the nature of the circumstances must be, the success of his pupils in the class-list, or, as the phrase sometimes runs, "getting classes for the college," we can hardly expect much enthusiasm for learning, or any very exalted ideal of education. Again, it is idle to expect bricks without straw, and a profession which holds out no reasonable prospect of an opportunity of settling in life is not likely to be attractive, especially in a country like England, where the prizes of other professions (including that of the directly competing profession of the schoolmaster) are so large and so numerous. Considerable as are the corporate revenues of the universities and colleges, there are hardly a dozen places in either university which offer a decent competence to the teacher, unless coupled with the restriction of celibacy (the headships, of course, I exclude, as not directly connected with the teaching). Hence that uneasiness about the future, and that constant hankering after some other profession, which are so notable among the younger residents, and which must necessarily be so unsettling as to render almost impossible a life really devoted to study and learning. A man, who is always thinking of quitting his house, naturally does not take much pains to improve it. About the diagnosis, at least, there can be no doubt. Nor can there, I take it, be much doubt amongst impartial observers as to the nature of the required remedies.

T. FOWLER.

## A NATIONAL TRAINING TO ARMS.

THE question of the maintenance of our land forces in a condition of efficiency, while adhering to our proud national principle of voluntary enlistment for the regular army, is one which appears to me to have become now, the most pressing that Parliament has to deal with.

If a sudden war takes us almost unprepared, as it would do within the next four years, from the want of efficient reserves, though we should eventually come out of it victorious, yet we should do so crippled with a doubled debt, after the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of lives, and all those reforms that we are looking forward to, would then be necessarily postponed for thirty years. If, on the contrary, we are found fully prepared in the political crisis which is fast approaching, no one will venture to assail us; our legitimate interests will be respected. We may stave war off for a whole generation,—nay we may postpone it altogether as far as England is concerned. An instant preparedness, therefore, is not only our best policy of insurance; it is a sacred duty that we owe to ourselves and to the world, in the interests of the general peace.

The recent so-called mobilisation of the army comes most opportunely at this moment to enable us to take stock of our means of offence and defence. As a means of bringing home to every mind in the nation our present lamentable weakness and the knowledge of what we want to complete our power, it will do a great national service at this juncture, and we must hail its promulgation accordingly. If it proclaims the fact that we are about 65,000 men short of the war establishment of the Infantry of the Line and the Militia taken together; and that we can barely muster 342 out of the 720 field-guns represented as necessary for our eight Army Corps, it cannot be too strongly or repeatedly impressed on the national understanding. And the country owes Sir Charles Ellice, the Quartermaster-General, its grateful thanks.

I have said that the main gain of the mobilisation scheme is to teach us how *little* we have, still more how very much we have *not* got. Thence an easy inductive step is, how are we to supply the great and acknowledged deficiencies?

Let us apply ourselves to the examination of the figures of our available Army in detail. When we come to test our power for offensive foreign war (and all effective defence of our scattered empire necessarily involves war abroad on some part of the field), the mournful fact is not to be disguised, that we are very little more than half as strong as in justice to ourselves we ought to be.

The recent changes in our army organization, though they have made us infinitely stronger than ever we were before, as I propose to show by a few simple figures farther on, have not produced results in any sort of way proportionate, even for our limited policy, to the gigantic strides made in the same time by other Powers. We have perhaps doubled our former fighting power, as it stood twenty years ago. They have quadrupled and quintupled theirs, nay, multiplied it by ten in some cases.

Let us compare then, our present effective force, with that we had at the breaking out of the Crimean War in February, 1854. It was then with great difficulty, and only after six months' delay, that we could put 30 battalions, or some 27,150 infantry; 3,000 cavalry; and 92 field-guns, into the field. I maintain that we could now, from the forces in Great Britain alone, and without drawing upon India or the colonies for a man, put into first line, at about forty-two days' notice, about 50,000 good infantry, 4,600 excellent cavalry, and 252 field-guns, right well equipped. The artillery, moreover, could be reinforced at another month's notice, to buy the extra horses, up to 342 guns, or rather more than 6 guns to every thousand men. No foreign army has more than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to the thousand. The guns and equipment for 36 more batteries, or 216 guns, stand ready in Woolwich Arsenal. The Depot brigade and the Army and Militia Reserve would give the men. And this force sent abroad would still leave us about 20,000 more fair infantry at home, to supply the casualties of the field as they arose; and this is still irrespective of some 8 to 10,000 more old soldiers, discharged ten-years' men, whom we could without difficulty raise by special war bounties in a few weeks. And 342 guns sent abroad would still leave 126 field-guns, or 21 skeleton field-batteries, at home.

To have accomplished so much in four years, for this improvement in strength dates almost entirely from Mr. Cardwell's reforms of 1870-71, reflects the highest credit on the war-minister, who then, for the first time, introduced the principles of a methodical and symmetrical organization into our hitherto chaotic system. Moreover, we had in 1854 only 44 battalions at home; we have now 77, of which 50 could, as I have said, be put at once into first line; we had, as late as 1870, only 180 effective field-guns; we have now 342, of which at least 252, or 42 batteries, could be put into first line with six weeks' warning, and the rest, or 90 more, a month later. We had in 1854 no Reserves whatsoever, we have now some 36,000. These great results speak for themselves. When the bitterness and excitement caused by the abolition of purchase have died away, and men come to judge the past fairly, history will do justice to the statesman whose sole conception and work these great and solid improvements have been.



But when, on the other hand, we come to look at the composition of the 50 battalions we should be able to send into the field, the result is anything but satisfactory.

Let us look at it a little in detail. The 50 first battalions for service on their present, or peace, strength could barely furnish between them 25,000 effective rank and file, including 3 battalions of Guards, but deducting casualties. Their war strength is 50,000 men, consequently the balance, or 25,000 men, would have to be drawn from the three following sources. First, partly from the 23 line battalions left at home (which, as they would themselves be wanted shortly after, it would not be wise to weaken too much); second, from the Army Reserve and the depots; and third, from the Militia Reserve.

Let us see what each supply would afford. Leaving out of sight the 3 battalions of Guards, which would form as a brigade a part of the expeditionary force, and which would be easily brought up to 1,000 rank and file each from the 4 other battalions of the brigade remaining at home, we now deal with the 47 line battalions which stand first on the list for foreign service.

		Rank and File.
The first 4 only of these now stand at		$820 \times 4 = 3,280$
The next 11 at . . . . .		$600 \times 11 = 6,600$
The next 32 at . . . . .		$520 \times 32 = 14,640$

Nominal strength of 47 battalions. . . . .	Total	26,520
--	-------	--------

This is their nominal or supposed strength: but we must count upon, at least, one-fifth, or 20 per cent. being unfit for service, as either too old, and waiting for pension, or too young for the hardships of the field, or sick in hospitals and in prisons. Making this moderate deduction, therefore, our 47 battalions would number but 21,216 men fit for the field. Now for the means of reinforcing them. It is obviously desirable at the beginning of a war to start with as many thoroughly trained soldiers as possible. The first step, therefore, would be to draw upon the 23 line battalions remaining at home. These stand at a strength of 520 rank and file each. The utmost number, therefore, that could be safely taken from each, so as to leave them fit eventually to take the field themselves, would be 200 men. This even is straining the drain beyond prudence, though necessity would compel it. From the 23 home battalions,  $200 \times 23 = 46,000$  men. The Army Reserve, begun in 1867, but into which, be it observed, no men of those enlisted for six years' service since 1870 under Mr. Cardwell's scheme have yet passed, muster on paper, 7,900 men; all trained soldiers. Doubts have been expressed of the existence of this Reserve. I think these doubts are not well founded. All that can be said is, that with the small exception of only 5·8 per cent. of them, the whole number have regularly appeared for payment quarterly

for the last four years. However, I will count upon only 5,000 men from this source, because many of the 7,900, though good for garrison work, are, as I saw last year, much too old for the field.

Thus far we have counted upon only good and thoroughly trained soldiers. But we have as yet gathered only 30,816 of the 47,000 wanting to complete our line field force. From this moment the remaining sources we have to draw upon are not nearly so satisfactory. The 34 brigade depôts already formed, and 37 depôts attached to regiments, have a nominal strength of 7,992. We might safely draw from this source 3,000 men.

Now, there remains only the Militia Reserve to draw upon. These number nominally 28,900 men. That number, fully, has been present at the last three annual trainings; it amounted in 1871 to 31,000 present. But probably 3,600 of these (the War Office returns do not show the exact number) belong to the Militia *Artillery* Reserve, therefore would be required to reinforce their own arm of the service; deducting 10 per cent. of the remainder, a very modest estimate, as unfit for immediate service, we get about 21,960 men to fill up the line. Of these, 13,184 would go to the 47 field battalions. The rest would join the 23 battalions remaining at home, and whom we have just depleted of 4,600 soldiers, and which they would bring up to nearly their full strength of 1,000 rank and file each. To recapitulate, our 47 field line battalions would be made up to war strength as follows:—

Composition.	Nominal Strength.	Unfit and Casualties.	Effective.
47 line battalions first for service .	26,520	5,304	21,216
From the 23 battalions remaining } at home . . . . .	11,960	. . .	{ take only 4,600
Army Reserve . . . . .	7,900	2,900	5,000
From the depôts . . . . .	7,992	. . .	3,000
Militia Reserve (infantry) . . .	24,400	2,440	13,184 <sup>1</sup>
Total effective of the 47 line battalions.			47,000
The three battalions of Guards . . . . .			3,000
Total field infantry . . . . .			50,000

But here comes the weakness of our position. Of these 47,000, about 31,000 would be thoroughly formed soldiers. The other 16,000 would be scarcely trained at all. Those who had had most military experience would have been out at say three annual militia trainings of one month each. Those few who had joined the Militia Reserve since 1874 would have been out for twelve weeks' drill, and in so far, better than the others.

(1) The other 8,776 would go to fill up the twenty-three weakened home battalions.

But the great weakness of our present transition state, terrible for a soldier to contemplate, who knows how the regimental *esprit de corps* is the backbone of our army, is that in addition to nearly one-third not being soldiers at all, *almost three-fifths of the whole Field army would be men who would be entirely new to their regiments, new to their companies, new to their officers; and who had never seen their comrades in their lives before, till within perhaps six weeks of going into the field, where they might have to oppose men who—under any one of the foreign systems—were all serving beside comrades and under officers whom they had known and worked with for years.* I wish to speak with all moderation, and without exaggeration. But this is emphatically not the composition of an army such as England, in justice to the ancient renown of her soldiers, in common fairness to the generals who were to lead them, against numerical odds perhaps of three to one, ought to put into the field to sustain her honour. The men from the Militia Reserve are, I have no doubt, equal to the average of their countrymen both in spirit and in physique. But they simply are not soldiers. They have learnt the use of their arms; those regiments which I have myself had to inspect have manœuvred very fairly well; they have done wonders in fact, considering their short training. But they have not learnt the habits of discipline; the instinct of the soldier, the mutual reliance and confidence in their comrades and their officers, which makes a man ready to do and dare anything, and which it takes at least two years, and perhaps three, to instil into an Englishman. And, be it remarked, every battalion and every company of the whole field force, with the exception of the three battalions of Guards, and the four first line battalions, who stand at 820 men, would be composed, in half, if not in three-fifths of its whole strength, of these untrained and new men—soldiers only in name.

If it be asked, what has caused this? How is it we have not larger trained Reserves? I can only reply that the one unaccountable oversight of Lord Cardwell's organization appears to be that in the beginning of 1872, after a system of short service had been decided upon, which, at six years' service in the ranks and six in the Reserve would, if the army had been kept at full strength, have given us in the year 1882—83 a maximum Reserve of trained soldiers of 75,000 to 80,000 men, it was unaccountably overlooked that to produce this Reserve the line battalions must be kept for four or five years at an increased figure.

The attainment of this Reserve in the given time depended wholly on two conditions:—

First. The enlistment for six years of from 30,000 to 32,000 recruits annually.

Second. The passing into the Reserve of a consequent and cor-

responding flow of from 20,000 to 22,000 men annually. This required a temporary increase of the Establishment ; in place of which, however, the inexplicable oversight was committed of reducing the Establishment, between 1st January, 1872, and the end of 1873, by more than 8,000 men, principally in the line infantry : consequently, instead of some 32,000 recruits being required annually, on which calculation the future force of the Reserve was based, only 18,000 to 20,000 have been enlisted ; and the number of men to pass into the Reserve in the corresponding years has been of course proportionately reduced.

TABLE OF MEN ENLISTED IN EACH YEAR, AND OF THE NUMBER THAT WILL PASS INTO THE RESERVE IN THE CORRESPONDING YEAR, SIX YEARS LATER.

Number enlisted for Short Service in each year.		Of these there are now still serving (in April, 1875).	Number who will pass into the Reserve in each year.	
Year.	Number of Men.		Number.	In the year.
1870	2,402	1,547	1,411	1876
1871	9,145	6,230	5,234	1877
1872	10,261	7,675	5,970	1878
1873	9,854	7,744	5,560	1879
Total .		17,196	18,175	
The War Office Return does not go beyond 1873, but has been continued, approximately, from other sources, as below :				
Year.	Number of Men.			
1874	12,856	..	About 7,480 }	1880
1875	{ About 13,924 }	..	7,854	1881
1876	{ Say the same, 13,924 }	..	7,854	1882—3
			Total Men.	In the year.
The Reserve will consequently, on reaching its maximum, number a total of about . . . . .			About 41,363	1883—84 }

A very wide and sad deficiency from the 75,000 to 80,000 which the Reserve was expected to produce by that time !

Also, in consequence of very few men having enlisted for short service in 1870-71, when the idea had not yet firmly taken root, next year, 1876, only 1,460 men will pass into the Reserve ; and it will only be in 1877 that any considerable number, and then only between 5,000 and 6,000, will go into it. The actual numbers are given on this page, from an actuarial calculation made in the War

Office, and granted to me as a return by the Secretary of State for War, on my motion of the 28th April, 1875.

The difficulty, then, that we have to deal with in the future, and the rapidly approaching future, is this :—

The Reserve which we have been looking forward to will, it is now certain, be formed far more slowly than any one ever anticipated, and will never reach the expected total. In four years hence, or the end of 1879, it will only have amounted to about 18,000 men; while the present existing Reserve of 7,900 will by that time be reduced by one-half, from the men's terms of service gradually expiring in the interim. From both sources, then, we cannot count, at the end of 1879, upon more than about 22,000 in the Reserve.

The Militia Reserve of 28,000 of very partially trained men is therefore our main, if not our only stand-by, if war overtakes us in the interval. The sudden influx into the ranks of the field army, on the outbreak of war, of more than one-half of nearly untrained men incorporated into every battalion and company, is, as every soldier of experience will admit, enough to jeopardise the value of the whole army as a reliable fighting force.

Having examined the questions of numbers, and of military efficiency as regards training, let us now look at the much disputed point of physique of the men enlisted since 1870, on which so much was said, well and indifferently, last Session. Lord Elcho, Mr. Holms, and Colonel Mure, have not hesitated to describe them as "wretched boys," "miserable weeds," the "waifs and strays of society." The Duke of Cambridge and the Secretary of State for War, on the other hand, have always maintained that, though they are undoubtedly younger than the men we used to get twenty-five years ago, and though the larger proportion of young men, amounting to 200 or 300 in each battalion, therefore gives an appearance of feebleness to the whole, yet they are good stuff, improvable in time; and when well fed and cared for, rapidly growing into stout and efficient soldiers after from two to three years.

I have taken the greatest pains to ascertain the truth, and have had exceptional facilities for doing so.

Out of thirty years that I have had the honour to serve her Majesty, the last eighteen years have been almost continually on the general staff, in both the two great departments of the army. This has brought me in contact, daily and hourly, with almost every regiment in the service. In India, in Persia, on the Aldershot staff, in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and finally for four years in Ireland, I have been brought into constant communication with every one of the 141 battalions of the line, except thirteen.

The opinion I have arrived at; then, is that the men we have been getting since 1870 are most decidedly of considerably lower standard, both in height and physique, than those we used to get thirty years

ago, and especially at the time of the Irish famine of 1847. In 1870-1 and part of 1872, a very large influx of very inferior lads took place; mostly from the brigade depôts, and especially from certain brigade depôts in particular, which it would be invidious to particularise. Boys of 16 and 17 declaring themselves to be 18, were carelessly passed into the service without sufficient examination and supervision. In the latter half of 1872 this, however, improved most decidedly; principally because of the attention repeatedly drawn to the subject by Lords Strathnairn and Sandhurst in the House of Lords. As the brigade depôt system has gradually got into better working order (and it must be borne in mind that it is not half developed yet), selection in recruiting has been more carefully made. In 1874, and more especially in 1875, most commanding officers declare themselves satisfied with the quality of their recruits. Yet not one of them would, I am persuaded, either desire or venture to assert that there is any comparison at all in physique between these men, and those of from twenty-five to thirty years ago. They are younger, shorter, and weaker. And be it remembered that with a short-service system, such as we have entered upon since 1871, it is more than ever essential that we should *begin* with a well-developed lad not much under 20 years of age. For when we enlisted men for 21 years, it did not matter if a considerable proportion began at 16 and 17. They were lost sight of in the large preponderance of older soldiers; and as they had to serve for half a life-time, if they developed into stalwart men after five or six years' service, our object was accomplished. But now the very essence of the Reserve system is, that you should pass men rapidly into it, in considerable numbers, after three to six years. And if you get your recruit at 17, he is only 20 by the time he ought to be passing into the Reserve; and he is neither a soldier, nor even a full-grown man then.

Mr. Hardy has most wisely persevered in maintaining the brigade depôts, in spite of the ignorant clamour raised against them by those who cannot understand the immense advantages: First, of a local military connection, such as the Highland and the Irish regiments have alone maintained during the last seventy years. Second, of the grand saving of labour, time, and confusion, in event of war or invasion, in having the work of the Militia and Volunteers, and the depôts of the line, *decentralized* in the able hands of sixty-six selected Colonels, commanding at as many local centres, instead of being all thrust at once, amidst indescribable hurry and disorder, on the already overburdened Chiefs of the Auxiliary Forces at the War Office. Never was money better spent than that which shall make this system of decentralized work perfect and complete.

Having now endeavoured to give the facts of our present army condition, as accurately as possible, and without party bias,

let me sum up with a general review of the results of what has been done since 1870. This will come most suitably perhaps in the form of two questions, and their answers.

*First.*—Do the results of the new system, up to the present time, give us reasonable hope that it will answer the national expectation?

*Second.*—May we rely upon a steady flow hereafter of from 25,000 to 32,000 young men annually, on the present terms and inducements of voluntary enlistment and of fit age and physique to fill the ranks of our army, and to allow of a corresponding draught of 20,000 trained soldiers, of about 24 years of age, annually to the Reserve?

I wish I could answer the first question without any qualification whatever. I can only do so, with the following material modification: This depends entirely upon our having the necessary time of uninterrupted peace allowed to us. The Reserve system will be at its maximum in the year 1883. It will certainly not, at the present rate of progress, give us 80,000 men in that year, but only between 40,000 and 45,000. If these figures are to be exceeded it must be either by the enlistment of older men, or by drafting a considerable number of men of three years' service into the Reserve.

To the second question I answer unhesitatingly: A review of the results, till now, gives us no reasonable hope whatever that we shall be able to keep up the sufficient supply of serviceable men; especially after 1877, when 5,334 men will go to the Reserve and some 29,000 will consequently be wanted for the army.

The army at home and in the Colonies (excluding India) is now 4,000 below its proper strength, even on a reduced peace establishment. The Artillery are 1,200 short in gunners, consequently in big and powerful men. They can get as many dwarfish drivers as they please. The Guards again, tall men of large chest measurement, are 420 short; or nearly the strength of a battalion of the line, out of a small peace establishment of 5,250.<sup>1</sup> Though the past winter has been one of exceptional depression in the coal and iron trades, and slackness of business generally, when it might naturally be expected that, as in former similar cases, recruits would come forward briskly, the report of the Inspector-General *shows a falling off of nearly 2,000 in recruits alone, as compared with last year.*

What further is wanted to prove that the sufficient supply of moderately powerful men is already exhausted, even before the coming drain of the Reserve scheme has begun to tell? Does anybody suppose this state of things will improve? It is to be devoutly hoped not, for it simply means that the country is

(1) So much is the labour of big men like the Guards in demand, that I am told it is an ordinary practice for employers to pay the money to purchase their discharges, even without any guarantee that they will remain with them.

so rich and prosperous, that the labour of big men, of good constitution and decent character, can command its own, and an ever-increasing price. This is highly satisfactory to the political economist, but it is madness and distraction to the economical army reformer. And it can't improve; but must get worse. There is manifestly no elasticity in the system; no vitality, much less any steady flow of men that would give any large margin to come and go upon.

We are 4,000 below the established strength now; reduced age and reduced physique notwithstanding. We shall be many thousands short, as soon as the draught to the Reserve begins in 1877. Evidently on the first strain of war the supply of men would collapse altogether. It is better that we should acknowledge the truth now, when it may be remedied, than four or five years hence, when it may be fatally too late.

Let us look at the question of physique again, for a moment, from the point of view of the real test of armies, namely, the marching power of their infantry. It has been my lot to see something of hard marching in my time. On the 16th July, 1857, at my father's battle of Cawnpore, where he beat the Nana in the full flush of his treacherous triumph over the luckless but heroic handful who defended Wheeler's entrenchment, the test put upon our force was not so much one of fighting as of marching power.

The men who saved India that day, the eight hundred grand tough old soldiers of the 78th Highlanders, 64th and 84th regiments, and 1st Madras Fusiliers, represented 1,400 who paraded for the march that morning. Between 3 A.M. and 7 P.M. they marched that day twenty-six miles under a frightful sun, and fought hard for four hours afterwards. They had, moreover, come a hundred miles in the five previous days, with one halt to destroy Futtehpore town, always under the July sun of Central India. Moreover, to add to the immense physical strain, from causes beyond control in that rapid advance, and in spite of the utmost efforts of the Commissariat officers, most of the men had had no regular meat meal for over forty-eight hours. The meat killed for them on the 14th of July had become putrid, from the intense heat, before it could be issued. On the 15th they fought twice, and got to their halting ground at dark; and in consequence of the stoppage of the bridge over the Pandoo just behind them, most of the men were asleep, dead beat, before the hard ration of bullock-beef could be brought over and issued to them. Being left uncooked, it was spoilt again by the tremendous heat before daylight, and the men threw it away in disgust. The tinned meats and preserved rations that have saved many an over-marched soldier's life in later wars, by coming at the very nick of time, were not known in those days. They got



nothing but biscuit that night, and only a little more biscuit and some porter at the short halt before they went into action on the 16th.

A greater test of bodily endurance and toughness probably never was applied. It was lucky there was no large admixture of pretty short-service striplings there, but all big, gaunt, bearded men thirty years old and more. At the close of that memorable day, of the 16th of July, as darkness fell just as the last of the enemy's guns was wrested from them, we had not eight hundred men, all told, left in line. In spite of almost superhuman efforts, the rest had either straggled, fallen to the rear exhausted (in which case many were cut up by the rebel cavalry), were detached guarding baggage and captured guns, or were killed or wounded. We had not a single gun in line; the draught-bullocks, exhausted even more than the men, were stuck fast in a ploughed field a mile behind. At that moment the fate of British India hung in the balance. It hung on the strength and endurance—the marching power, in fact—of those eight hundred well-proved soldiers, the sturdy remains of half as many more who could not keep up. Three of the regiments were fortunately composed of men averaging twelve years' service, and seasoned, not weakened, by an average residence of about eight years in India. Those three regiments had each from 220 to 250 men in line. The fourth regiment, largely composed of recruits, of equally high spirit certainly, and who displayed repeatedly a temper and dash never surpassed in war; had barely 120 men to the front. The rest, poor lads! though they staggered on till they were nearly blind with exhaustion, nerved by the hope of saving their countrywomen and children, simply could not keep up. They had either to be left with the baggage, or dropped by the road-side. I say nothing of moral endurance or of courage; they are the natural inheritance of our whole race, mature men and fledglings alike; but I do say unhesitatingly that the "staying" power of those eight hundred tried old soldiers held India for England that day. At the decisive moment the rush with the bayonet, and that alone, did the work, and those eight hundred tough old soldiers carried all before them without a check.

But if even one-third of those 1,400 men we mustered that day had been of the average quality, age, strength, and size of more than half of each of our present Aldershot battalions, I fear much the result would have been widely different. Their hearts would have been just as big, but more than half of them would have been simply not equal to the continued physical effort of so tremendous a strain.

Let me call to mind again what I saw in France in the last week of August, 1870. The First and Second German armies united under Prince Frederick Charles were holding Bazaine locked fast up in Metz. Their Third army, under the Crown Prince of Prussia, and their Fourth army, under the Crown Prince of Saxony, both under

the immediate command of the Emperor himself, were pressing on towards Chalons, expecting to meet MacMahon at bay there. I was some miles behind their centre; for the first time in my life a peaceful spectator in war, trying to do a little for the cause of humanity by carrying the noble succours of the English Red Cross Society where they were most wanted, to the wounded of both nations alike; therefore utterly neutral, but still, as a soldier, not unobservant of the interesting moves of the great game going on around. On the evening of the 25th of August the great body of German cavalry, 120 squadrons, which had been pushed on to reconnoitre Chalons, sent back word to the Emperor's headquarters at Bar-le-duc that MacMahon had given them all the slip; that, with a start of more than four days, he was hastening northwards, endeavouring, partly by railway and partly by road, to get past the Germans by Rheims, Rethel, Chéne-Populeux, and Montmedy, to the relief of Bazaine. Here came again a fair trial of sheer marching power. The French had seven clear days at their disposal to cover 105 miles in. The Germans, from pressing hitherto due west, had not only in that one night to turn all their seven corps, division by division, over an extended front of forty-five miles, into a new direction due north; but then the arduous task lay before them by marching not less than twenty-seven miles a-day for some divisions, and over twenty miles a-day for the nearer ones, to endeavour to overtake MacMahon near Stonne or Mouzon, and cut in between him and Metz.

This was to be done by sheer marching: leg-power, and that alone. Not an inch of it could be aided by rail. It was the most interesting military study I ever saw. All the world reads the story now, as it is unfolded, bit by bit, in the truthful, matter-of-fact, yet graphic pages of the seventh volume of the German Official War Narrative. We know the result: how the French failed to make more than 67 miles in seven days; how the Germans, under every disadvantage, by mere endurance, did their 25 to 27, and even 29 miles a day, cut in before the French, and not only anticipated them long before reaching Metz, but, by rapidity of movement alone, forced them to abandon Bazaine to his fate, and to turn back North to that hopeless rat-trap at Sedan. Once hemmed in there, the end was a foregone conclusion. Escape from that circle of crushing artillery fire was hopeless. There on the 1st of September the French Empire was drowned in blood, the victim of military maladministration, and of false confidence in an unsound system.

But not the less was the immediate cause of that catastrophe the inertness and lowered marching power of their dispirited and over-weighted infantry, recruited under a system of substitution, that left it only the physical dregs of a great people, instead of the flower of its warlike strength. Let us ponder the lesson in time. Four

years hence, just about the time the Eastern pear is ripe for plucking, according to the calculation that keeps Russia wisely and warily inactive now, the moral may be studied too late.

I have quoted these instances of tests of endurance and power, because they suggest to my mind this grave consideration. Are our Infantry, as they stand at present, and as the system now existing promises to make the bulk of them four years hence, equal to the high standard we require? Are they up to the level of what our old soldiers in India did in 1857? or to the level of what the Germans did in 1870? In my judgment, which may be fallacious, but is certainly unbiassed, there is but one answer. Most decidedly and emphatically not.

Our race has in no whit deteriorated. It has notoriously improved, in every class of life. The tall, stalwart men we want are to be seen everywhere, except where they are most wanted—in the ranks of our army.

This simply means that our army system is no longer in harmony with the national development in all other respects, but has fallen behind it. To bring the two together again we must devise new means, by adapting our new social circumstances to the old, unalterable military principles. Let our army be once more recruited, under similar circumstances, to the men who conquered, despite of climate and hardship, in 1857; who were enlisted, be it recollected, in 1847-48, at the time when the distress in Ireland brought the pick of her agricultural class into the ranks. Or let them, by an improvement of our present system—by increased inducements, in fact—be drawn once more from even the middle strata instead of the very poorest, physically, of our working population, and we need not fear comparison with any army in Europe. We should be able again to march with any nation in the world. And it cannot be too often repeated, even at the risk of wearisome reiteration: henceforth, more than ever, marching power means success in war.

I feel bound to explain why I hold this unfavourable opinion of a large part of our Infantry. I took the greatest pains to get at the exact truth last year at the summer manœuvres. Besides following the movements of the troops, closely, from week to week, noting the effective of each regiment, and the numbers that “fell out,” I made it especially my business to be present at the last day’s march in on the 22nd of July, and found myself that day usefully employed in closely observing every Infantry soldier of the force at Aldershot, as they came into camp at the conclusion of the month’s manœuvres. There could not have been a better test, in peace time. The troops had lived in almost incessant wet for a fortnight; the last week but one had been so bad that they could

scarcely lie down at night. On the other hand, they had been excellently fed; had had regular hours, long rests, a splendid climate, and no protracted night-work. I watched every man of the Infantry closely as they came swinging in with an elastic step, at the end of their 22-mile march that day, in full marching order. Their appearance was admirable; the cheerfulness under discomfort, the light-heartedness and good-nature, the excellent feeling manifest between officers and men, made me, as an Englishman and a soldier, proud of the temper of that force. As a good judge said that day, "These lads would take a lot of beating." But, when I pictured to myself how these boys would have stood the hard grinding, short feeding, constant alternate drenching and roasting of the summer of 1857, during the Indian mutiny; the tedious dark night marches, and long fasts, and blazing sun, I could not but feel that it was well they were not so tested. There was no more comparison between them and the hardy veterans of 1857, than there is between a schoolboy and a full-grown navy. Nor could I think of them for one moment as equal, physically, to the hard, wiry Bavarians, or the sturdy, broad-shouldered Pomeranians and Brandenburgers whom I saw march the French down in 1870. The contrast was nothing less than painful. About a third of them had, in sporting phrase, "had enough." A little more strain, and they would have broken down.

This, then, sums up the whole case against them. For such work as the intense strain of the Indian mutiny, or the hard marching the Germans went through in the last ten days of August, 1870, one-third of our infantry, at least, would be "nowhere" in a fortnight. They may be nice growing lads, but they are emphatically not the stuff that successful campaigning armies are made of.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The stuff we have in the ranks of our infantry is fairly good; it has improved perceptibly in the last eighteen months; it is perhaps equal to the ordinary contingencies of war. But it is decidedly *not* fit to represent the English nation worthily side by side with continental armies;—it is decidedly *not* equal to any extraordinary emergency, and it is as decidedly not likely to improve under the present conditions of our service. The changes of 1870 have wrought wonders comparatively; but they will not produce the results expected of them, either now or four years hence; not because they were faulty in themselves, but because they have been since outmatched and outstripped by forces of steadily increasing intensity, telling on the recruiting question, and which will continue to tell upon it, heavier and heavier day by day, in the future. The sooner we realise this hard fact the better for the nation.

But there is yet another point of view from which the supply of

men is a more complete and deplorable failure than any other. That is, the extent to which the line and Militia starve each other by absurdly and unwisely competing for almost the same class.

To refer to the mobilization scheme, as a test of the collective numbers of both branches of the service. The figures therein imagined stand thus:—The 8 army corps we possess, upon paper, are intended to consist of 21 battalions each, or 168 in all. Of these 64 battalions are of the line, and 104 of the Militia, which are to be brigaded together. Now the line, artillery and infantry together, are already over 4,000 short of their peace strength. The Militia, besides, is 35,464 short of its *peace* establishment, for it numbered only 88,384, rank and file, at the last training, out of a supposed strength<sup>1</sup>—again on paper—of 123,848. But, as we have shown, the line would want the whole 28,900 of the Militia Reserve, and more, immediately on the declaration of hostilities. Consequently it stands to demonstration that the 168 field battalions of both would, immediately on the outbreak of war, be found to be, between them, about some 60,000 to 65,000 men short of their proper strength!

Where are these men, or the half of them, or even the fourth of them, to come from, at six weeks' notice, with the present inducements?

Clearly, unless the competition between the Militia and the line is stopped, the voluntary system is for the future a dead failure.

We all know that when prices are once raised they are never allowed to go down again. We cannot attempt to compete with private employers of labour, by raising the soldier's 8s. a week to either 12s. or 14s. It is out of the question.

A mere increase of 2d. a day means an addition of £365,000 to the estimates, which already reach £14,000,000. A general rise to 16s. a week, therefore, as Mr. Holms proposes, would amount to £2,689,000 more, or a gross army charge of *over sixteen millions and a half a year*.

No ministry would venture to propose this; the country would not tolerate the idea for a moment; and very rightly, because under an improved system it is unnecessary.

I have already mentioned that the greatest blot of our system is the competition for absolutely the same men between the Militia and the line.

This is apparent to all. Mr. John Holms, the able and talented member for Hackney, says, "Get rid of this competition, by doing away with the Militia." Well, that would certainly be a very simple mode of proceeding, if only it were safe. But most people

(1) See Parliamentary Paper, No. 94, of 1875. Return to the House of Lords on the motion of Lord Foxford (Earl of Limerick). Printed on the 7th May, 1875.

will, I think, prefer to say, "Tell us first what you are going to give us in place of the Militia?"

To that end let us examine what the Militia are; what they now do for us, and what they have done for us in the past. I must altogether deny that the force is the "useless toy" which Mr. Holms supposes it to be. I have had to inspect many of its regiments, especially in Ireland, and I can only say that if I had had the power of transferring those thousands of fine young fellows to the line bodily as they stood, I should be much better satisfied as to the prospects of the strength and efficiency of our army than I am at present. The Militia Reserve, especially, are almost the flower of the working class of this country. They are sturdy farm-labourers, artisans, miners, colliers, iron-workers, and such like, earning good wages all the year round, and liking the month's summer training as a holiday. 30,000 of the best of them are already under engagement to join the line in case of war. If such men prefer to come to us through the Militia, instead of by direct enlistment, it would be most unwise and inexpedient to hinder them. Then, too, what have the Militia done for the line in the past? To quote Mr. Holms's own figures, from his valuable paper read before the Brighton Social Science Congress in October last, they gave the line, during the Peninsular war 110,098 men; during the Crimean war, 71,182 men; and in the last four years they have given the line no less than 20,000 men. At Waterloo, these Militia volunteers composed one-third, if not more, of those steadfast squares which stood like rocks amidst a foaming sea, and against which the flower of the French Cuirassiers flung themselves the whole day long, repeatedly but in vain.

On the embodiment of the Militia, at the commencement of the Crimean war, nearly 20,000 Militiamen volunteered to the line *within one month*. This, then, is a solid source of supply that it would be most imprudent to meddle with destructively till we can see our way clearly to substituting something as good or more reliable in its place.

Mr. Holms argues that the Militia are no longer necessary, because the Volunteers would now entirely supply their special function and office, that of taking charge of the home garrisons and arsenals in time of war, and thus leaving our whole regular army free and available at once for operations abroad. But unfortunately, in advancing this opinion so confidently, Mr. Holms proceeds entirely upon assumption; for he asserts that regarding which neither he nor any one else has ever yet brought forward one atom of proof. In fact, all the evidence we have in the facts of several years' past experience points to an exactly opposite conclusion. We know that it is with the greatest difficulty, after every sort of cajoling and coaxing, and indirect subsidising, that any com-

manding officer of a Volunteer corps has ever been able to get much more than 150 men of his regiment together for even seven days' consecutive embodiment in camps in the autumn. There may be one or two singular exceptions to this rule. I believe Colonel Lloyd Lindsay's corps is one, but I am not aware of another. What childishness it is therefore to talk of the Volunteers ever undertaking to fill the place of the Militia for permanent embodiment in our camps and garrisons in time of war. Moreover, I directly put this question to Lord Bury, an enthusiastic Volunteer colonel, in a correspondence that took place between us in the *Times*, in December, 1874, as to how many Volunteers he thought he could assemble for this purpose for even one month, to say nothing of a year or two, in time of need? It is scarcely necessary to say that Lord Bury found it convenient to leave this home question unanswered; nor have I met with any better success from any of the many Volunteer colonels to whom I have talked on the subject. They are all loud in declaring that "the Volunteers are ready for anything that may be required of them," which in the abstract nobody doubts; but when it comes to details as to numbers and periods of embodiment, there come on a vagueness and uncertainty that are, to say the least, not reliable elements in a military calculation.

A recent number (25th December, 1875) of the Volunteers' own organ, the *Volunteer Gazette*, devotes an elaborate article to proving that it is neither legal, reasonable, nor possible that they should be called out, "either 1y fourths at a time or in any other way," for any contingency whatsoever, except a distinct threat of actual and imminent invasion. It is at all events satisfactory to have any doubt on this point solved authoritatively by the self-appointed mouthpiece of our citizen-soldiers; and we would commend this article to Mr. Holms's serious consideration before he proposes to go further in doing away with the Militia.

Let me not be misunderstood. No one has a greater admiration for the Volunteer movement, and for Volunteers generally, than I have. I was one of those who, at the very infancy of the movement, ventured to say, when some military critics of the clubs sneered at it, that I could see no reason why Englishmen of higher physique, and of much higher education and intelligence, than the men of the line, with proper instruction and encouragement, should not become as good troops for home defence as any in the world; and the Volunteers have fulfilled, and more than fulfilled, my prediction.

But the question is not as to the high qualities of the Volunteers, which nobody who knows them doubts, but it is this: could they, and if they could, would they, take up the charge of our garrisons in permanent or even in temporary embodiment, in time of war, so as to relieve our whole regular army? In the absence of any proof

to that effect, I must continue, reluctantly, to believe the contrary. I have not the slightest doubt that, in case of invasion, we should get not only 170,000, but 300,000 of them under arms in twenty-four hours; and that you might rely upon them—all traffic and business of all sorts being necessarily suspended by invasion—to hold together as long as there remained a foreign soldier on our soil. To meet invasion they are, and will, I trust, continue to be for many years, our best and largest Home Reserve. But to talk of them as a substitute for the Militia is merely self-deception, and another of those popular fallacies so prevalent in this country, from our happy ignorance of practical military matters.

The sooner this pernicious fallacy is carefully examined, dissected, and then blown to atoms, the better for the prospects of a refoundation of our military strength on a sound basis.

So much, then, I think I am justified in assuming as a consequence of the argument that has gone before, *that an intermediate available force of some sort we must always have as a connecting link between the line and the Volunteers*, a force that will become embodied for permanent home service, perhaps extending over three years, immediately upon the declaration of war; and by thus relieving our line troops in the garrisons, arsenals, and great camps of the kingdom, release the whole available regular force of Great Britain, and a part of that of Ireland, for immediate operations abroad.

Such an intermediate force, of the necessary strength, we have not got in England at present, because the Militia are only half their numbers. And should Mr. Holms's measure be carried out, and the Militia abolished, we should have no semblance at all of such a force. The Volunteers, as I have carefully shown, cannot fill this gap; their functions are widely different. The *Volunteer Gazette* says frankly, and without any circumlocution, that they would not attempt it; that they are not intended for that sort of work.

It is evident that something must be done to amend our position, and that shortly; and grave and heavy will be the responsibility of the present war minister if the Session of 1876 passes without that something being done, to carry on a step further the successful labours of his predecessor. The twelve lines of strategical railways that Russia has built with English money since 1854, and which will be complete in two years hence; her 2,250,000 of armed men that her General Service decree of 1870 will make disposable in 1878; the tearing up the treaty of Paris; the 200,000 men kept constantly massed in the Caucasus, which, now that the Poti-Baku Railway and the steam flotilla on the Caspian are complete, are within thirty days' rail, steam, and march from Herat, are none of them defensive measures, and moreover they can be aimed offensively at nobody but us.



If I am unduly urgent, in season and out of season, for "something to be done," in the Session of 1876, it is because we must legislate now, if we are to be safe five years hence. No reform that we may now initiate, however wisely conceived it be, can give us, with our limited numbers, any appreciable result as regards infantry reserves, before 1881 or 1882. According to a trite, but true phrase, "a good deal may happen before then." There is, therefore, no time to be lost. Our military situation is simply this. With our line 4,000 below a reduced peace strength now; with the necessity of finding some 9,000 more recruits in 1877 staring us in the face, and an increasing demand impending in each year afterwards; with the Militia about 60,000 rank and file below its strength, and steadily decreasing too; with the recruiting returns of this year showing nearly 2,000 less than last year; it is too plainly evident that the present system has ceased to supply us adequately with the free flow of men to the army and the Militia which we want, even in time of peace, and that it must inevitably utterly collapse and break down with the first strain of war.

To talk of successfully prosecuting a war, which we should begin with 65,000 men short of our home or defensive force, with such means, is simply folly.

The casualties of war are now calculated at about 40 per cent. of the infantry alone, during the first twelve months, and of the other arms in a less proportion. Is it not evident that within two months of the outbreak of war, we should be at our wits' end for men? Our present supply would not carry us successfully through the first three months of a stiff war against the conscripted thousands of Russia.

I have shown already at page 444, that one alternative proposed, viz., an endeavour to keep pace with the pecuniary rise of the labour market by increased pay alone, is wholly out of the question—even in peace time. It is well known now that the present government propose to meet this difficulty by an increase of pay only. I have no objection to that—if only it could be shown that it would be effectual and final.

But I do not hesitate to declare and avow my belief that increased pay *alone* will not solve the question. Experience in the past tells us so plainly. We had an increase of 2*d.* per man per diem to the line in 1867, and other advances to the Militia, making a total of just £500,000 a year. In 1873 again, we had another increase, which, between free ration of about 4½*d.* a day to the line, with corresponding deductions, amounted to about £180,000 a year. Neither of these has improved our position in the least. In fact, now, in 1876, we are considerably worse off as to supply of numbers and as to physique than we were in 1873: most decidedly, in physique, 20 per cent. worse off than we were in 1867. Why, then, should we

expect greater results from the proposed increase of pay in 1876? The increased demand for labour is a steadily rising tide. It has swamped us on both these former occasions, and will do it again in three or four years hence, just when it will be too late to apply any other remedy effectually. With this worse result; that though we are in profound peace now, quite possibly four years hence, or 1880, may find us on the verge of a general European war.

What is to be done then? Must we come, as so many insist, to compulsory service for the Militia in its old objectionable form, as applied during the war with France, at the beginning of the century? Is there no intermediate course open? I believe that there is: one widely different from, and yet more effectual than, a pure compulsory service; a mode as opposed to conscription, or to ballot for the Militia, as now popularly understood, as the voluntary labour of hired men is the opposite of slavery. And so believing, and with the earnest desire to solve this question satisfactorily, I venture to submit, in all diffidence, for the careful and deliberate judgment of the people of England, that which I believe to be the groundwork of a sound system of national defence.

I believe this remedy to be in a joint application of two distinct means to the same end. Not doubled estimates, but a small and carefully graduated increase of pay, as deferred pay, to the line, and consequently to the line reserve also. Not conscription, or anything like it; not even ballot for the Militia, in the sense in which it was understood between 1805 and 1815, or even in the form in which many would desire to reapply it now; but a general national training to arms, almost entirely optional and voluntary, the principal inducement being the large money prizes to be gained by the wage-earning class by previous training, and temporary engagement in time of war; but with just so much of a wholly altered and restricted ballot applied to the formation of a Local Militia, as would, while forming only a subordinate feature in the scheme, serve to regulate and methodize it throughout. A general national training to arms, commencing with boys at school at twelve years of age, and extended, once a week on Saturdays only, till the age of twenty-one. But regulated so as to produce, by means of a modified ballot, for a strictly local militia, 36,000 men a year, selected by lot from the whole number trained, on whom would devolve the embodiment for local garrison service, *only in time of war, and then only for three months in each year for each individual; thus to take the place of the present Militia.* The basis would be the ballot, compulsion it is true; but compulsion only adopted to that limited extent which the nation shall deliberately and unanimously consent to accept, after the fullest examination of the question in all its bearings through its representatives in Parliament. I do devoutly believe that if we can divest our minds of long-standing prejudices, and

look at things as they are, and not as they seem to be, the way out of this difficulty is not hard to devise. If we have the moral courage not to turn away and stop our ears at the first sound of the horrible name "ballot," but to face this spectre boldly, and handle it; familiarise ourselves with it, and learn its details thoroughly, so as to know what to adopt under restriction, and what to reject uncompromisingly; what to bear cheerfully as equitable, and what to resist constitutionally to the last inch; our task will lighten as we proceed. The proposition of a modified ballot for Militia is not to be dismissed in a sentence, either for admission or rejection. It is a complex one, and contains quite such opposite elements, of intolerable evil if abused, and yet of vast available good if judiciously used, as those indicated above. I believe, under calm examination, a system of sound yet easy general national training can be devised, which, as coupled with a strictly modified ballot *for a strictly local Militia*, can be made not only tolerable, but perfectly acceptable to our proud, captious, liberty-loving people. It is time that the generous lesson the Volunteers have given us should bear fruit in a more extended voluntary assumption of a duty that belongs to us all alike, but has hitherto been borne by only a section of the nation.

The very first condition towards the military burden of the nation being assumed, voluntarily, by all, would be, that it should be so equitably adjusted as to bear equally upon all, "without partiality, favour, or affection." The details of this might and probably would even include a graduated payment from the richer to the poorer classes as compensation for the loss of their time, which is to the labouring class the bread of their families; this compensation to be arranged according to income.

We require, then, to substitute for the present Militia one purely local in its liability, subject to embodiment only in war time, *and then only for three months in each year for each individual*; with this further restrictive probability, that as the improved means of communication allow men to assemble so rapidly at local centres now, the class of the *current year*, that is, the class under drill at the time of the breaking out of war, would probably suffice for all purposes of defence of the garrisons while being thus trained for six months, and the others, after being once drilled, *would probably only be called out in turn for six weeks in the year, even during the hottest war*. The cost to the country of four reliefs in the year would undoubtedly be considerable; but the indirect gain to the revenue from only 30,000 instead of 120,000 pair of hands being withdrawn from productive industry at one time, would more than compensate for it.

This plan can be worked so as to be burdensome to none, and to entail scarcely greater individual loss of liberty than the Volunteers

have voluntarily and spiritedly taken upon themselves, for the nation's good, for the last sixteen years. I freely admit that, in this respect, they are my model, that they have taught me the lesson I here strive to utilise. I am, I hope, above all things, a staunch Liberal. The principle of our constitution that I hold the dearest is, that of the perfect equality of every man as before the law.

In advocating, then, a modified form of Militia ballot in order to save us from national humiliation, it need scarcely be said that the present Ballot Law (suspended annually since 1829 and permanently since 1860) would not be tolerated now for one moment. No government could venture to revive it in any emergency, however great, and I said so repeatedly last year; for it contains the gross injustice of two forms of exemption of the most inequitable, I had almost said iniquitous, nature; one exempting a man who pays a £10 fine, the other for every man who becomes an effective Volunteer at his own expense. Neither of these exemptions could be dreamt of for a moment now. They would be simply privileged class evasions of a general and public duty, which could only exist in the dark times of popular non-representation, or misrepresentation, before the Reform Bill of 1832.

Their result, if ever revived, would be to form a net, through the meshes of which every man of an income over, say, £3 a week might escape; while every poorer man would be bound to serve compulsorily. It is superfluous to say, those who fought so wisely and so well last year for the amendment of the Labour Laws would not tolerate this for a moment.

To divest ourselves of erroneous popular notions, let us see, first of all, what is Conscription?

It is the practice, prevalent in foreign countries, of taking men forcibly from their homes to serve; first as soldiers; secondly, in the regular army; thirdly, in war abroad. How does this resemble a Militia ballot? A modified ballot for a purely local Militia would be the reverse of all this, on all three main points. It would in fact not only be the opposite of conscription in every particular, but it would make conscription for ever impossible in England, by showing that it was totally unnecessary. The balloted local militiaman would serve, first, near his own home; secondly, not in the regular army, but in a local Militia consisting of his acquaintances and neighbours, and under no circumstances whatever, abroad; and thirdly, could never be engaged in war, except in the case of invasion, for the defence of his own home; which is what the Volunteers have already spontaneously undertaken.

What would a balloted local militiaman's liability amount to? That, if war occurred in the same year in which he was balloted, he might be kept in a camp or garrison for six months; his wife and

family, if he had any, being meanwhile supported by the State, and he receiving free food, lodging, clothing, and 2s. a day pay.

If war occurred in any of the three following years to that in which he was balloted, his time of embodiment would only be six weeks.

And by his twenty-fifth birthday he would be entirely free from liability of any sort to the State. Never, under any circumstances, could he be sent out of the United Kingdom; never could he be engaged with an enemy unless that enemy had already landed on our shores. The legal liability of the Volunteers after embodiment by order in Council, is already, I repeat, precisely this. Further, as the period of liability to be called out would only extend to four years, from twenty-one to twenty-five years of age, the chances would be ten to one against a man's ever being called out at all during his time of liability. It might happen once in a generation.

The number of young men reaching twenty-one years of age annually in England and Scotland is about 225,000. This plan does not of course apply to Ireland. That country, in consideration of her exceptional circumstances, and her only recently revived prosperity, ought to be exempted from any species of compulsory service for many years to come, and should be left free to supply, as heretofore, the line and her own Militia with such men as choose to embrace a military life voluntarily. It would be manifestly neither politic nor just to do otherwise, considering what might be the position of a balloted Irish militiaman in relation to questions which affect closely both his religion and his politics.

By drawing 36,000 men annually to the Militia, or about one man in every six, which, deducting casualties, would give eventually an effective force of about 30,000 from each year's class, the total in four years, the limit of time proposed, would be about 120,000. Enough to admit of a fresh relief of 30,000 every three months to the garrisons in time of war, as proposed by the mobilisation scheme for the Volunteers, and yet not too much for the defence of the kingdom, if the whole 120,000, in addition to 21,490 Irish Voluntary Militia, and to 170,000 Volunteers, were called out together to meet invasion: the regular army, all but 20,000 in the garrisons, being at the same time engaged in a foreign war.

The Local Militia should be chosen by ballot from all classes, without substitution or money exemption. Religious scruples against military service, such as those of the Quakers, and the family exemptions for domestic reasons, common to all countries, should be the only ones admitted.

I have said that the ballot would be the means of selection. But once that was conceded as a principle, the great aim of the State would of course be to lighten the burden by every possible means. To this end the great engine would be a gratuitous preliminary

Anticipatory Training for all who chose to accept it, from the age of twelve to that of twenty-one; with this great object, by anticipating the chances of the ballot, to make the training *subsequent* to being drawn as short as possible.

This would lighten the obligation, especially to the wage-earning class, so as to reduce it, in practice, to next to nothing, while at the same time the *possible* power of keeping a man out for six months when balloted, though it would probably never require to be used, could be judiciously managed so as to get the highest degree of military efficiency, by making it worth every man's while to work to the best of his ability, both at the preparatory drill school and at the four weeks subsequently at the brigade dépôt.

This great lever of ballot, then, properly used, would effect two great results:—

*First*, It would train about one-half to one-third of the effective youth of the nation to a partial, yet a very considerable, knowledge of arms.

*Second*, It would fully repay the country for any outlay, for these thousands of partly trained men, probably about 120,000 a year, would represent so much more immediately available reinforcement for the Volunteers in case of invasion.

Having fixed the maximum time of drill for a militiaman at six months as Mr. Hardy's Militia Laws Consolidation Act did last year, the State should freely give every man in the country, rich and poor alike, the means, gratuitously, of anticipating his possible chance of being caught by the ballot at twenty-one years of age. By thus enabling him by previous drill, first at school from twelve to sixteen, and then in a Government military drill school from sixteen to twenty-one, to qualify himself beforehand, at his leisure hours, and therefore without pecuniary loss, once in ten days say, extended over those five last years, *so that he could pass as a drilled soldier within three, four, five, or six weeks after being caught by the ballot*, it would confer a great boon upon the classes whose time is their money, and the burden of the ballot would become thus almost nominal.

Time gained is the first object, and the second object, and the third object, in modern war. And the value of the time thus gained in previous instruction and preparation, and having about one-third of the effective youth of the country so far taught as to be able to take up arms, in defensive positions, at a week's notice, would be incalculable in a money point of view. It is the system that enables Switzerland to hold her own, and preserves her frontiers from violation. Thus could this great change be accomplished with no loss, or next to none, to the working classes, to whom of course it would be a greater object than to richer men to anticipate the future training. The Government Drill Schools, superintended by carefully chosen, efficient regular officers, should be open every

night in the week, except Sundays. Working men would probably drill on Saturday afternoons only. Professional men, tradesmen, and men of leisure, would suit themselves, on any evening, or night, they pleased. A close register would be carefully kept at each school of every individual's attendance—dates, hours, and progress. It would become a detail for future consideration whether the poorer working men—earning, say, less than five-and-twenty shillings a week—should not be paid 2*d.* an hour for good drill, especially if they had any distance to come in the country. Payment always to be conditional on the completion of so many—a fixed, qualifying number of drills.

The process of gradual national instruction would be thus. In every school throughout the country, a Government drill instructor, an old soldier, qualified by a certificate, and paid 2*s.* a week extra to his pension, would attend, one afternoon in a week, for two hours, to drill the boys, over twelve and under sixteen, in a few simple, marching movements (strictly according to the Field Exercise) in gymnastics and drill, without arms.

This step alone would effect one great and good thing. It would improve the health, physique, and bearing of hundreds of thousands of boys, and teach them habits of order, regularity, obedience, and combined action. No one who has read the touching accounts of the burning of the *Goliath*, of the heroism, devotion, and generosity shown there by the boys, can doubt the moral as well as physical good such a training to combined effort would do the nation.

As to the more advanced Government Drill Schools. These should be scattered over the country as widely as possible, but with careful regard to the necessary localities. They could best be formed by Government taking over, at a liberal valuation, or acquiring temporarily at an agreed rent, the present Volunteer drill sheds and halls, all over the country; which, however, could still be used for their present purposes, though enlarged if necessary.

My object is not to sweep away the Volunteer system, but to utilise it as much as possible, by grafting it on, and partially incorporating it with, the new proposed local Militia system. They would thus be two great means, each totally distinct in composition, in quality, and in degree of the military obligation they each incurred, but both working harmoniously together to the same end—the national defence. The present Volunteer corps would lend local assistance to the anticipatory drill of the local Militia by leasing them their sheds; the local Militia training staff would infuse a far greater element of order, regularity, and discipline into the Volunteers, who used the same drill places, but in entirely distinct classes, by the indirect example of their more stringent military organization, habits, and responsibility. This is my answer to Lord Bury's most reasonable challenge that the Volunteer system should not be

annihilated, but utilised. I perfectly agree with him; and it will be a matter of pleasure to me if experienced and zealous Volunteer Commanding Officers will consider the subject and throw out valuable suggestions for the development and perfection of the proposed system. Moreover, any man whom the ballot had *once passed over* would be free to join the Volunteers. No doubt thousands would do so. The two systems thus would mutually help each other.

But to use the ballot as Lord Elcho wishes, as I hope he will pardon me for saying he evidently does,<sup>1</sup> as merely a means towards forming a gigantic Volunteer army, double the present numbers, but under no more stringent conditions of service than at present, would be disastrous. It would be to repeat most inexcusably the great mistake of our early experiment in 1803, which of course failed from its own inherent and incurable vices. The full account of that failure will be found in Mr. Clode's excellent book, "The Military Forces of the Crown," at page 314, vol. I. Mr. Windham, taunting Mr. Addington with this failure, in the debate of the 9th December, 1803 (See Hansard, Old Series, vol. I., page 179), said, "The right honourable gentleman has not only *not* provided an army, he has made it impossible that an army should ever be provided. For" (by this misapplication of the ballot) "he has locked up 420,000 men, out of an available strength of 500,000, in an army of Volunteers," where they were of no use either for permanent embodiment, or to re-inforce the line. It is to be hoped that all future modifications of the ballot will at all events avoid this fatal mistake.

Now, as to the indirect action of this limited ballot upon the line,—not the least important of its probable effects. If once ballot is recognised by the nation in its limited application to the provision of a local Militia from all classes of society, and not from a small section of one class only, the *indirect* stimulus given to recruiting for the line will be enormous. In this way. The gentleman, or professional man, or tradesman, balloted for the Militia, will, I grant, rarely, if ever, be induced to volunteer for the line, except under the impetus of a great popular war. With the working man or artizan, earning a pound a week or less, if thus balloted, the case would be entirely different. He will deliberately weigh his pecuniary chances in the two lines of military service then open to him—the one compulsory and non-paying, the other voluntary and highly remunerative. And many a fine young fellow, who would never look at the army as now constituted and paid, will then reason with himself thus: "I am balloted for the Militia. I shall be called out for five or six weeks' drill this year certain. And any time during the next four years, if war break out I may be put into a garrison

(1) See his speech to the Volunteers, at the Shaftesbury Park Estate, on 5th June, 1876, and his letter to the *Daily News* of the 21st January, 1876.



or camp for three months each year; getting only 8*d.* a day clear, and perhaps permanently losing my engagement at my employer's. I shall thus be out of work perhaps four or five months; and if I complete this militia liability, I shall have nothing to show for it at the end. Why not volunteer for the line at once for three years home<sup>1</sup> service? I shall come back with £18 to £20 in my pocket. I never can hope to save the half of that at my trade. Besides my lump of hard cash, I shall have earned 6*d.* a day reserve pay to keep me for the next nine years at my business. Here goes for the line, for three years' Home Service."

The regular army will thus get many a promising recruit, whose vacancy in the local Militia will be at once filled up by ballot. If this source only gives us 6,000 men a year out of the 36,000 the ballot would annually catch, it will have done a great deal; quite enough, together with the stimulated voluntary enlistment at increased pay (see further, p. 459), to keep the line quite full, and to fill it with the right stamp of men.

But the most momentous bearing of a general national training, used conjointly with a system of anticipatory drill, to forestall the chance of the ballot, has yet to be considered. I have estimated the probable numbers that would take advantage of the anticipatory instruction at about 120,000 a year; or half of the youth attaining twenty-one years of age annually. This would give, in five years' time, a body of about 500,000 men (deducting for deaths, &c.), who were, more or less, trained to arms.

They would have each undergone, probably, first, 40 drills a year of 2 hours each at school, for 4 years, equal to 160 drills; and about 40 drills a year of 2 hours each on Saturday, for 5 years, at the Government drill schools, equal to 200 drills, or a total of 720 hours' drill each; equal, excluding fractions, at 3 drills a day, to about 240 days, or 8 months of continuous drill; or, deducting for the effects of intermission, say only equal to 4 months of continuous drill. This is, however, a vast amount of instruction when combined with the gradually acquired habit of discipline. Of these 500,000, perhaps a quarter, or 125,000 out of the whole, would be of the class and pecuniary circumstances to be liable to be tempted by a large war bounty, say 25 or 30, or even 40 guineas, to volunteer for the line in time of war *for the duration of the campaign only*. This is the most effective mode of getting men in large quantities at short notice and for short periods.

(1) An article in *The Times* of the 28th December last showed that under the new system of linked battalions the period of any one regiment's home service can now be foreseen and known to a certainty, except in case of war. The recruit could thus ensure three years' home service, by choosing a regiment which had five or six years' home service yet to run. Men now enlisted are allowed the widest choice; and an officer, not under the rank of colonel, is present, at their final engagement, to advise them on that choice.

If any one doubts that such a general national training to arms, with the ballot as a regulator and incentive only, would be conceived in the direct and immediate interests of the working, or wage-earning, class, let him consider the subject for a moment in its operation on volunteering on the breaking out of a great European war.

As I have shown, our present system, and I fear any possible modification of it also, would leave us at the end of two months' hostilities at our wits' end for men. But that is just the crisis in which the vast benefit of the "anticipatory training," to both the individual and the State, would come into play. The working man who had escaped the ballot altogether, but who had, between the ages of twelve and twenty-one, obtained from the State a gratuitous military training of 720 occasional drills, the equivalent, as I have said, of four months' consecutive drill, would at once command the situation. His military marketable value, as a partially-drilled soldier, would be at least £25; and he could secure this amount of bounty at once, by walking into the nearest barrack, and engaging for the line, for the duration of the campaign only. This rests on actual facts. In the second year of the Crimean war, the bounty for a cavalry recruit reached £10, for an infantry recruit £8; and the levy money in each case was respectively £11 13s. 6d. and £9 18s. 6d. more; making a total of £21 13s. 6d. for a man enlisting for cavalry, and for infantry £17 18s. 6d. This was for a totally untrained and often immature lad of 5 feet 2 inches. The value of a robust working man, twenty-six or twenty-seven years of age, with muscles in hard, working training, already a drilled soldier, more highly disciplined than any present Volunteer, from the fact that his occasional training—and therefore gradual military indoctrination—had extended over nine years, would manifestly be much more. At the outset of war he might command £25, rapidly rising, as the war continued, to probably £40, or more. The bounty to volunteers during the American war of 1861-65 went up to £50, and then to £60, a man; and doubtless with us it would be higher if the war lasted: for in the Peninsular times it amounted, in some cases, to 60 guineas for a Militia substitute, and the average price for a line recruit, from 1808 to 1814, was £40.

Thus the national anticipatory training would put the working classes of this country not only in the position of being on an equality, or at no pecuniary disadvantage, with richer men, if caught by the operation of the ballot for the Militia, but in war time would give them a highly remunerative war value, acquired without cost to themselves, and without having been withdrawn one hour from their ordinary industrial occupations.

I therefore confidently affirm that this modification of any future Ballot Act is that for which any Liberal reformer, and every Labour representative, should strenuously and uncompromisingly strive.

At all events, if this be not adopted, let us, who have those interests at heart, insist on hearing nothing more henceforth about the application of the ballot to the Militia, in any other way, such, for instance, as Lord Elcho's proposition, which would be distinctly opposed to Labour-class interests. And it is self-evident that this national system would be best for the State also. For, first, it is the only means which we can ever hope for of rapidly expanding our peace establishment army of 100,000 men to a war force of 200,000. No Reserve system whatever, be it Lord Cardwell's, or any amplification of that, will ever bring our war force, for operations abroad, to more than from 120,000 to 140,000 infantry; and it will take at least eight years more to do that, whereas a general training would give us the means of deploying 200,000 in five years from this time. Then, as was the case with the Americans in 1865, immense economy would ensue from the immediate disbanding of the temporarily engaged men on the termination of the campaign, with a gratuity of three months' pay per man. Of the 600,000 men who marched past the President at Washington in April and May, 1865, after the defeat of the South, before six weeks 500,000 had returned quietly into civil life and to industrial pursuits. And we might similarly reduce a field army of 200,000 by at least 60,000, in a month. Of course, a liberal scale of widows' pensions, and of gratuities for wounds, would have to be adjusted to the conditions of service of these temporarily engaged men. But such a general training would establish at once a flexible mode of ready expansion suited both to our military, industrial, and economical needs. This would be a measure neither Prussian nor French, but essentially English.

Probably it would be very rare—with the immense incentive to diligence that the *power* of detention would give, and at three drills a day, under competent and practised instructors at the brigade depôts,—it would be very rare, I say, for a man to be kept more than four or five weeks—including musketry—before being dismissed home as a “passed” and trained Local Militiaman.

Once the principle is accepted, a hundred ways would be found by our practical, quick-witted people, for lessening the time of drill, and yet keeping the instruction effective, for all practical purposes.

This, as will be seen, is no intolerable burden; it would, indeed, be scarcely felt even by the poorest, to the moderately well-off and the rich, it would be mere healthy pastime. Yet by means of judicious use of the great lever of the power of detention, it would undoubtedly give us, *what we have not now, and never shall have under any existing system*, a local Militia, composed of the flower of the youth of the country, at their best and freest age, highly disciplined; drilled to that extent, that with six weeks' more continuous ~~embodiment~~ (and we shall always have at least that amount of warning before an invasion) they would be equal to any local troops in the

world ; and with this advantage, which no other plan can give us, that their numbers, though only 120,000, would be always full to the complete establishment. The power of counting upon absolutely certain numbers, at a certain place and time, without fail, is worth all else besides, in a military calculation.

And one immediate effect would be, that when men of wealth, intelligence, and education were in the local Militia ranks, the officers of Militia would require to be both more thoroughly educated professionally, and of the highest social standing. Every man, in every grade of military life, would be raised one step higher. Men of the highest birth and position would be proud to compete, and to carefully qualify themselves professionally, for the active command of their county local Militia regiments.

The scheme may seem an ambitious one, but for a great and rich country like this a wide and comprehensive military policy, adapted to every circumstance and every class of its people, is the most economical in the end. The money-saving, by adopting a general training, together with a modified ballot for the Militia, would be about £160,000 a year upon the two items of bounty now given to Militia recruits on enlistment and on the item of bounties annually to men re-engaging in the Militia Reserve.

But the ultimate saving in reduced estimates would be considerable. And as the bounty to Militia recruits would cease at once after 1st January, 1878, there would be, immediately the system came into force, about £160,000 available annually, which could be employed in increased pay to the line.

The scheme of this paper has throughout contemplated a close adherence to the great national principle that for the regular army—that is, for colonial service and war service abroad—men must be got solely by making it worth their while pecuniarily ; which means increased advantages in the shape of a slightly increased pay, but far better applied and distributed.

The means to this end for the line are contained in the principle of Deferred Pay, in lieu of pensions. Thus, and thus only, can line service be made the thing I have often desired to see it—a paying career for the working class.

A rise of 2*d.* a day to the private soldier, and in proportion to the non-commissioned ranks, would, I am persuaded, if applied in the shape of deferred pay, *and simultaneously with the application of ballot to a local Militia*, and with an increased pay of 6*d.* and 8*d.* to the Army Reserve men (according as they went into the Reserve after three or six years' service), get us out of all our difficulties. The total cost of this increased pay to line and Reserve would be under £500,000 a year.

The system of deferred pay would answer the same purpose as regards the soldier, that the friendly and benefit societies do for the

labourer and artisan. It would be a perfectly fair bargain for the State to drive with the man, to make him thus thrifty in spite of himself, and compel him to provide for the future; even though it be at first against his will. Of course this deferred pay should belong inalienably to the soldier. It should be subject to no deductions whatever, and not liable to forfeiture for any crime he might commit, except the one offence of desertion.

Fourpence a day, thus banked for three years, with interest, would send the man to the Reserve with £20 to his credit, or if he served six years, he would leave with some £40 to £43: a sum which a labourer or farm servant may wait half a lifetime before he can accumulate. On passing into the Reserve, two-thirds of the accumulated sum should be paid to him at once to set him up in civil life, and the other third retained, still at interest, as a guarantee against his absconding or emigrating. The pay of the Army Reserve, also, should be raised slightly. Fourpence a day, the present Reserve retaining fee, is totally insufficient. It is barely enough to keep a man from starvation; and most soldiers who have taken it would be only too glad to be back with their regiments if they could return.

Short service and deferred pay, and increased Reserve pay, I say again, on this improved scale, would make the army a profitable career for the working-class.

To recapitulate the heads of reform: Establish general national training, distributed as follows:—

1. Drill in schools from twelve to sixteen years of age, under old, certificated, soldier-instructors.

2. Higher Government drill schools for adults, for the “anticipatory drill,” previous to ballot.

3. A modified ballot, to select a local Militia.

4. Drill, at brigade depôts, *after* ballot, the legal maximum to be six months, reducible by individual diligence to three or four weeks or less, according to the proficiency of the man.

5. Higher drill (officers’) schools, having their head-quarters in each London Guards’ Barrack, at Aldershot, Chatham for Engineers, Colchester, Plymouth, Woolwich, lastly the Curragh and Edinburgh, for Militia and Volunteer officers.

6. Increased pay for the line of 2*d.* a day, as Deferred Pay.

7. Increase of the Reserve pay, to 6*d.* after three, and 8*d.* after six years’ line service; in each case with 2*d.* a day banked, at 4 per cent., to the end of the term of service.

And finally. 8. A short course at the Military Colleges of Sandhurst and Woolwich, for future officers for the local Militia.

The gradual means for bringing a local Militia into existence would be,—

1. Pass an Amended Ballot Law in 1877, to come into force on 1st January, 1878.

2. After July, 1877, enlist no more men voluntarily for the Militia, except those who would engage, at the time of enlistment, to serve in the Militia Reserve also; of course with the present additional annual bounty; *thus gradually converting the whole existing Militia, by purely optional and voluntary means, into a reinforcement for the line for war abroad.*

3. Open drill schools at every Volunteer head-quarters in town and country, including the company head-quarters of scattered administrative battalions, and invite those who would be liable to be drawn after the 1st January, 1878, viz., all the thousands of youths *now* of eighteen and nineteen years of age, to commence drilling at once, in order to anticipate the ballot.

4. By January, 1879, the present militia, from recruiting being discontinued, would have fallen off by about 30,000 men. The first draft of balloted men, to be called out for four, five, or six weeks' drill, according to proficiency, in March, 1878, would be 36,000 men. Between August, 1876, and March, 1878, they could work out seventy-two drills each. By March, 1881, the whole Militia would be composed of balloted men, and the whole of the present Militia would have either passed into the Militia Reserve, volunteered to the line under the increased pay and deferred pay inducements, or would have ceased their military engagement altogether. The men balloted in 1878 and 1879 would have to come out for a month each in the following year; as between 1876 and 1878 they could only, working their best, put in seventy or eighty drills each. After the third year of the system this could be eased off. By the beginning of 1882 we could look around us with confidence; having a full Line, a full local Militia, and a Volunteer force rather above its present strength. Our available force, in 1882, would stand as follows:—

	Men.
Local Militia in England and Scotland selected by lot from all classes of society . . . . .	120,000
Irish Voluntary Militia, as at present . . . . .	22,000
The Volunteer Force, say . . . . .	180,000
Yeomanry Cavalry and Enrolled Pensioners, as at present . . . . .	37,000

The above available *only* for Home Defence . . . . . 359,000

Available for service abroad we should have<sup>1</sup>:—

Army Reserve, as now gradually forming (see page 433) . . . . .	42,000
Reinforcements to the Army Reserve, by drafting in men of 3 years' service, say 3,000 a year only, for the next 6 years, as soon as a flow of recruits was secured . . . . .	18,000
Army Reserve, total . . . . .	60,000

(1) The present Militia Reserve would have ceased to exist by the expiry of their engagements.

## REGULAR ARMY AT HOME.

	Men.
Cavalry :—3 Household Regiments, 1,028 ; 19 Line Regiments, 9,458. . . . .	10,486
Royal Artillery, as at present . . . . .	16,742
Engineers, as at present (these are combatants only) . . . . .	2,701
Army Service, and Army Hospital Corps . . . . .	3,400
Infantry :—Guards, 7 Battalions at 750 . . . . .	5,250
The 30 Battalions first for service at 820 rank and file each. . . . .	24,600
The 20 Battalions next for service at 520 each . . . . .	10,400
The 20 Battalions last returned from foreign service, at only 400 each . . . . .	8,000
77 Battalions . . . . .	48,250
The 71 Depôts at home about (as at present) . . . . .	3,079
The Brigade Depôts, as now . . . . .	4,306
Total Regular Infantry serving with the Colours . . . . .	55,635
Total Regular Army at home, rank and file . . . . .	88,964
Regular Army in the Colonies, as now . . . . .	23,000

This would afford for service in the field abroad, at six weeks' notice, about :—

Field Army in first line :—74,000 excellent Infantry } . . . . .	81,000
7,000 „ Cavalry } . . . . .	
(sabres and bayonets only) and probably 420 field-guns.	

And there would remain about 30,000 good Infantry at home to fill up casualties abroad, as they should arise. The Artillery and Cavalry Reserves would probably number about 8,000 and 3,000 respectively.

Grand total available for Home Defence in case of invasion . 530,958  
And 720 guns.

The other alternative of a largely-increased expenditure only, by raising the soldier's pay up to 16s. a week, I have not so fully examined, because the whole country is now familiar with the arguments on that head, so forcibly adduced by Mr. Holms, in—first, his book, “The British Army in 1875 ;” second, a subsequent paper read at the Social Science Congress at Brighton in October last ; and third, his well-known speeches at Sheffield, Birmingham and Manchester, and the subsequent correspondence in the *Times*.

Mr. Holms has produced a most charming and very clever essay

(1) And this is entirely irrespective of the temporarily engaged men to be got by war bounties from the men taught by a general national training. These would certainly amount to 40,000 or 50,000 more, and would be ready to go into the field in eight to ten weeks from the commencement of hostilities, if the volunteering for war bounty was opened at the declaration of war. The infantry in first line would thus be 74,000 ; those ready to follow, at least 90,000 more.

on military service, but as a matter of demonstration he has, I trust he will pardon my saying, failed to prove his case. The replies of Mr. Hardy showed this conclusively last session; and he had the advantage of having the figures of Mr. Holms's scheme worked out for him, and thoroughly sifted by the most able official experts, both military and civil, before he spoke. I regret to say that a close examination of the figures, which I felt myself bound to make independently, has led me to the same result and conclusions.

The "doubled payment" plan is chimerical. It would cause immensely swollen expenditure in time of peace, and would utterly break down at the first strain of war. It starts with some 60,000 loss men.

The plan of a general Voluntary Training, and a modified Militia ballot, on the other hand, I have endeavoured to show, can be worked so as to be scarcely any burden at all to individuals. Constant means would be found to lighten its individual weight when once it was adopted, and instead of being anything like the bugbear conscription, *it would make conscription (which is compulsory service for the Regular Army) for ever impossible.*

A general national training for England would be the surest guarantee for the continued peace of the world. It would be decidedly in the direct interest of the working classes, both to those who would thus insist that the old unjust law should never be revived, to their special detriment, and those who by the indirect action of an amended law, would find a new and profitable career opened to them, both in better-paid short service in the Line and Reserve, or in highly-paid temporary service in war. A more thoroughly Radical measure than such a General Voluntary Training, together with a modified Militia Ballot, it is impossible to conceive.

I altogether disclaim any desire to dogmatise on this subject. I am not wedded to the proposed scheme, but merely submit it as one possible solution added to the many now before the public. The details can be modified indefinitely. I have attempted to sketch the main principles on which I believe a great, flexible, popular, national training to arms might be based. It contains undoubtedly a compulsory principle; but the compulsion is as but an ounce to a ton of voluntarism. It is used more as a stimulus and a regulator to the national training than as a legal burden.

The figures here given are entirely based upon parliamentary and official documents. I have endeavoured to represent the present condition of our army accurately; concealing nothing, palliating nothing, neither exaggerating our weakness nor overstating our strength. My object is to invite discussion. If the result be to elicit the declaration, *that neither in this extremely modified form, nor in any shape whatsoever, will the country tolerate any degree of compulsion, how-*



*ever minimised*, I for one shall not be disappointed. On the contrary, my object—to bring this question to a crisis—will be attained. We shall then have a clear and definite basis of expressed public opinion to go upon; and it is essential to have this soon. Henceforth we who desire economy must then be dumb; the only alternative left will be a largely-increased expenditure, and our task will be narrowed to selecting carefully from the several rival schemes for increased estimates that one which may appear soundest and best.

But I cannot conceal my apprehension that increased money alone will never accomplish our object. The desideratum is to make the army a national career. This can never happen till, in one shape or another, the richer classes—who are now standing aloof; who let the defence of the country be done for them vicariously, and who thus cast discredit on the profession of arms—voluntarily assume their share of the burden which is morally owing from them to this country of free institutions. Money alone I firmly believe, won't do what we want. A re-adjustment of the burden of Military Home Service, taking all classes alike, equally just to all, and yet affording a lucrative career of short service in the army to the poorer sections of the labouring classes, would, I believe, solve the difficulty. If we are grown so selfish, so apathetic, and so fond of ease, that we won't tolerate even this very slight restriction of individual convenience—I won't call it of individual liberty—for the national good, and in preservation of the peace of the world, then we must not grumble at opening our purse-strings very wide. We must be content to go on increasingly paying for our soldiers, whatever augmented price labour may periodically continue to rise to, and be also content to get an ever increasingly lower stamp of men. And having paid, and paid profusely for years, it is my firm belief that we shall still fail in maintaining an efficient army by that means alone; and that we shall be compelled at last, on the outbreak of war, to come to the Ballot for Militia; perhaps after deep national humiliation and the fruitless sacrifice of thousands of brave men to a false system.

H. M. HAVELOCK.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE decisive repulse of Don Carlos among the stony hills of northern Spain ; the remonstrance by the great powers with the Sultan at Constantinople ; the trial of the alleged leaders of the Whisky Ring at Saint Louis ; the opening of another session of the British parliament ; the election of a French chamber of deputies ;—these are the topics of a month. They all stand for phases in the evolution of the world's destiny, some of them very slight in significance, but one of them at least of something like capital importance. Perhaps even what looks so trivial an affair as the attempt to convict and punish the official defrauders of the revenue in the United States may be at bottom more important for civilisation than affairs of more august association. To purge the great democratic experiment of those elements of administrative corruption that make so fatal a mark upon it, must be an object of prime interest for all who have any faith in the future of the free government of nations by themselves. Less important than the purification of public life in America, is the victory in Spain of one kind of absolutism over another and a blacker kind of absolutism. A defeat of Carlists, even if decisive, hardly ends anything for Spain, when the defeat is effected in the interests of such a monarchy as King Alfonso's. The world knows what to expect from the monarchs of a Restoration. If we knew no more, the King's assurance in his speech on opening the Cortes (Feb. 15) that the "representatives of Spain and the Vatican are engaged in regulating the pending questions in the manner required by the interests of the Church and the State," is a word of doubtful omen. The deposed Queen is to return to her son's court. When the last Carlist partisan has hidden away his arms for his son to use the next time, no one who knows what a restored Bourbon is, and what the Spanish republican is, will feel that Spain is yet in the path of stable conditions. The extinction of Carlism, however, even for a generation, and even if it be but the signal for treading once more the sterile road of modern Spanish history, is welcome as a blow and a discouragement to the Black Party in Europe. The next centre of that party's attack on civilisation lies in a very different quarter, and the battle is to be fought with weapons from a different armoury—the steady attempt to wrest constitutionalism in Belgium to the purposes of clerical absolutism progresses, with a success that may be some solace for the defeats of Don Carlos.

The diplomatic agitation in Eastern Europe, after reaching its height in the resolution of the English Government to support the Andrassy Note, has for the moment lulled. We see how a mouse may creep from the labouring mountain. The Sultan promises to execute the reforms which Europe commends to him, and things will be after the promise exactly where they were before. The participation of the English Government

in the diplomatic action that has been taken, is an event of no considerable significance. "There is a kind of sensation," said Lord Salisbury a few days ago, "a thrill, a longing for action, a desire for a definite aim to be stated, and a definite policy announced." This may be so, but mere adhesion to the presentation of Count Andrassy's Note does not go very far towards gratifying such a sensation, and longing for action, and thrill. Nor is the present foreign minister at all likely to deal in the satisfaction of thrills and sensations. He is, as we must never forget, the man of the Luxemburg Guarantee, nor was his policy in 1867, in the Cretan rising, in the least respect outside that of the very strictest member of that Manchester school, which Lord Derby's party and its organs are accustomed to describe in such contemptuous and splenetic terms. And English opinion has moderated. Time brings roses even to the holder of Turkish bonds. Nobody of sense would raise a finger to keep the Turk at Constantinople, and we shall never again drift towards the objects of the Crimean War. But one or two tempering considerations have had time to make their way into opinion. Is it not always best to leave a violent solution of any political situation to the very latest possible moment, if it must at last be violent, and may it not be the wisest policy for comparatively disinterested powers like England, France, and Germany, to trust to some dissolving process in the Turkish Empire, which shall be at the same time a pacifically constructive process? It may be that the populations of modern Turkey, like those of old Poland, are, in spite of Servia and of Montenegro, wholly without the power of political construction, that they lack any patient, strong, clever race like the House of Savoy. But, after the first burst of sympathy with Herzegovinian patriotism, and the first burst of fury at unpaid interest, there has been a return to the old preference in England for seeing the Turk replaced at Constantinople by one of his own group of subject peoples, rather than by a Romanoff or a Hapsburg. Is it certain, again, that Austria herself is so much more free from internal distraction and from risk of break-up, than Turkey? And, again, England ceases to be a disinterested power when we are told by one good authority that, though it might be very well to drive the Sultan across the Bosphorus, yet the Sultan in Arabia might be a serious trouble, as he has already been a slight trouble, to us in our Eastern Empire; and by another good authority that a single Turkish battalion appearing at Bombay with the standard of the Sultan would be a worse danger to us than a whole Russian army on the Affghan frontier, because every Mahometan in India would be bound by all he holds sacred to rise and follow the symbol of the Padishah. Such points as these are coming out more prominently. They certainly tend to check anything like a policy of thrill and sensation, so far as England is concerned. They do not affect the general proposition that it would probably be best, if such a measure were possible and stood alone, for an Austrian force to help the Sultan in the execution of the required reforms. We may, however, do well to remember that in 1867, when Russia, France, Prussia, and Italy requested the Porte to include their representatives in the Commission for investigating Cretan grievances, the Porte refused to make even this partial and temporary surrender of sovereignty. The Sultan is too likely to adopt the same attitude now.

The electoral campaign in France, ending in the repulse of M. Buffet and the return of a decisive republican majority, is the most thoroughly satisfactory event in Europe since the ruin of the Empire at Sedan. It is perhaps the most hopeful incident for social progress since the victory of democracy in the United States ten years ago. In the first place it assures, or seems to assure, the final establishment of the only form of government that can ever be finally established in France. The Republic has been set up before now, but never the Republic of good sense. In 1792 and in 1848 the spirit of the nation was higher than it is now, and its mood more lofty and imposing, and on both occasions there were leaders of dazzling quality. But there was no political experience. The lesson had not been learnt, what are the limits of political action in social amelioration. The political capacity of France was pitiable, and her bad fortune was extraordinary. Good sense has not often had a chance until within the last three years, when a chief made his way to the front, who has the singular gift of investing this mere good sense with all the magnificence, sonorousness, and brilliance of attraction, that have hitherto been reserved to decorate the dreams and chimeras of politics. Gambetta has made political common sense as inspiring as the Rights of Man in 1785 and as Socialism in 1848. He has given it a size and spaciousness and imaginative colour which has made even the fiery and generously inflammable spirits of Belleville not only contented but enthusiastic. And what is curious is that Gambetta only five years ago was repulsed by the nation and banished, for a policy which is still admired by some, and which no doubt was full of audacity, but which, whatever else it may have been, was not the policy of prudence or sagacity. The patriot who talked and acted with the patriotism of sense at that sombre hour in the fortunes of France was M. Thiers, and at the last elections it was he who was placed in the triumphant position that to-day has been given to M. Gambetta. With the rapid versatility of true political greatness, M. Gambetta perceived what the fault of the revolutionary parties had been. They had for eighty years been dashing themselves against the nature of things, against the instincts of the people, against the whole set of conditions of social transformation, just as he himself had been dashing legion after legion in sterile conflict against the invaders. It was a revelation of genius to him that intrepidity, devotion, social hope, patriotic fire, might after all go with feasible aims and a right consideration of the relations between political cause and political effect. He satisfied the craving for violence in his extreme followers by the vehemence of his declamation, the deep tones of his voice, the wildness of his gesture, and the fierce readiness with which he retaliated on an interrupter. But underneath, all has been cool, as the head of a man who leads French liberalism needs to be, but too seldom has been.

In his electioneering speeches Gambetta has passed many gibes upon those whom he calls the play-actors of parliamentarism; yet it must be confessed that he has himself shown a very tolerable mastery of the arts, devices, costumes, properties, and stage-business of the parliamentary scene. His distinction has been that he never counted all this for more than it was

worth. He always looked, as our great leaders in England from Pym down to Chatham, and from Chatham's son down to Bright have looked, beyond the walls of the chamber out on to the forces of the country, its necessities, its sentiments, its prejudices, its hopes. He said at Belleville (Feb. 15) :

"Je suis d'une école qui ne croit qu'au relatif, à l'analyse, à l'observation, à l'étude des faits, au rapprochement et à la combinaison des idées ; d'une école qui tient compte des milieux, des races, des tendances, des préjugés et des hostilités, car il faut tenir compte de tout : les paradoxes, les sophismes pèsent autant que les vérités et que les généralités dans la conduite des hommes et des choses qui les intéressent. Aussi n'est-on un homme politique qu'à la condition de ne pas s'abandonner à des combinaisons de couloirs, à de misérables intrigues, à des personnalités qu'il faut laisser aux docteurs du parlementarisme."

In the same speech he won loud plaudits by the energy with which he set forth the following thrice and four times sound doctrine :

"Il ne faut jamais se payer de mots ni de phrases. Il ne faut jamais croire qu'on a la force quand on ne l'a pas. Il ne faut jamais croire qu'on est la majorité quand on ne l'est pas ; il ne faut jamais croire que tout est facile quand tout est presque irréalisable. Il faut être plus viril, plus exact, plus consciencieux, savoir résolument se placer en face de la réalité des choses, dresser le compte de toutes les difficultés, ne plus se payer d'illusions, ne se laisser abattre par aucun obstacle, poursuivre la tâche à remplir, le but à atteindre. Il faut marquer, regarder ses adversaires en face, et leur livrer bataille sous le regard de l'opinion publique."

This may seem very elementary truth to a nation of wide and fairly successful political experience like ourselves, but to the people of Belleville who have been taught for eighty years by their chiefs to pay themselves with words and illusions, to defy facts, and to perish under difficulties which they would rather perish under than admit, such sense as this, from a man who struck their imagination before he appealed to their reason, is like manna from heaven. It is incredible that the reactionary party in France and their unreflecting friends in the English press should be so blind and so unjust as not to see that the one hope for the stability of a government is that it shall be inspired by a man, whether Gambetta or another, who will use his power and influence to stimulate the political manliness and political conscientiousness of these vast masses of men whom former leaders made mad with empty phrases and futile passion.

There is another revolutionary delusion to which the new liberal chief will give no countenance nor question. From 1789 down to the last days of the Assembly of 1871, French politicians have had an undying faith in the absolute efficacy of laws, decrees, and ordinances ; in the immediate, indubitable, and permanent fulfilment of the objects at which such laws and ordinances were directed. Think, then, of the orator being interrupted for some minutes by the acclamations of his audience as he was speaking in such a vein as this :—

"Eh bien, la politique qui a préparé les résultats déjà obtenus est la seule qui puisse en poursuivre les fruits, la seule qui puisse déjouer les

pièges nombreux qui nous seront tendus par une réaction qui n'a plus d'espérance que dans nos défaillances et nos fautes. C'est maintenant qu'il faudra se surveiller soi-même, se régler et ne jamais aventurer un pas sans avoir bien reconnu la solidité du terrain, sans avoir assuré ses derrières, parce que le seul moyen d'aller loin c'est de marcher sûrement, étant bien résolu à ne jamais revenir en arrière quand une fois nous aurons planté notre drapeau sur une position conquise. Cette politique, qui est la politique des résultats, est la seule qui soit véritablement conforme aux intérêts de la démocratie, car ce que je veux, moi, pour la démocratie de mon pays, pour la France qu'elle est appelée à refaire, ce n'est pas une collection de décrets qu'on insère au *Moniteur* un jour et qu'on la réaction déchire le lendemain. Ce que je veux, c'est que l'égalité ne soit pas un vain mot, c'est que l'éducation promise au peuple lui soit donnée, non pas par des affiches, par des ordonnances mises sur un mur, mais assurée par des faits et des actes : par des écoles ouvertes par des maîtres en chair et en os, par des livres bien faits, par des programmes d'éducation, par des élèves qu'on fera entrer et asseoir sur les mêmes bancs, sans distinction de classe et de conditions, et par un ensemble de moyens pratiques et financiers qui fassent de la réforme que nous attendons non pas de simples formules, des vœux stériles, mais une réalité palpable et tangible, une action incessante qui descendra jusque sur le dernier d'entre nous, jusque dans les bas-fonds de la société, pour y porter l'air, la lumière et l'intelligence."

No wonder that the organs of the Irreconcilable section,—a section of excellent aspirations, very self-denying, very honourable, but without a method, and without either political science or political art—no wonder that they should cry out with an exceeding bitter cry against the "Policy of the Relative"—that they should accuse its author of murdering "l'idéal, la pensée, l'absolu, le sentiment." They compare Gambetta to Henry IV. with much bitter irony—an irony and a comparison that tell in literature, but in the heat of a deadly battle with such a foe as Imperialism are naught. Here is a sample :—

"Quant à ceux qui se firent martyriser pour leur foi, c'étaient autant de rêveurs et de niais, qui ne considéraient que la nécessité du moment ; s'ils avaient eu plus de sens et de jugement, ils eussent été faire un petit tour à l'étranger, et, la guerre civile apaisée faute de combattants, ils fussent revenus assurer le triomphe de Henri IV, qui, lui aussi, était partisan de la politique relative, et qui mit la réforme sur le trône en se déclarant catholique, absolument comme M. Gambetta proclame la République en cessant d'être républicain. La Réforme, mise sur le trône par Henri IV, a abouti au despotisme catholique de Louis XIV. Rien ne démontre absolument que le triomphe de la République n'obtienne pas un couronnement analogue." —(*Droits de l'Homme*. Feb. 21.)

What distinguishes the large and keen vision of M. Gambetta from the narrow vision of M. Buffet is that the latter has been sent into a panic by writers of this temper, while the former has seen that such a temper is not deep in the nation and not deep even in Paris, and has seen how to meet and transform it. His victory over M. Nacquet at such a town as Marseilles is one of the many striking proofs of the soundness of his calculations. It

would be childish for us to subside into the assurance that the Irreconcilable section will never again raise its head. Where things hang on a single life, it is impossible to be sure that there will not be either a monarchic restoration or an anarchic conflagration. All we can know for certain is that M. Gambetta has triumphed over greater difficulties than he is ever likely to have to face again, and that he has persuaded France that a man may be a republican, may repudiate theology (witness his speech at the funeral of Edgar Quinet), may promise war against the Church on a far more effective plan than Dr. Falk's, may be the representative and the hero of Belleville, and yet and after all may be the leader of a rational and practical party, and may be trusted to keep 'moral order' better than a sinister bigot like M. Buffet.

It is worth while to realise in actual detail what lines the policy of the most energetic portion of the French liberals is likely to follow. What does M. Gambetta's republicanism mean? What is the practical outcome of it? On what side will it first make itself felt? M. Gambetta's speech at Bordeaux (Jan. 18) answers all such questions about his programme.

"Ce programme, il faut le dire et le répéter, est très-mesuré, très-sage. Je ne dis pas, je me garde de dire que vos représentants l'accompliront pendant leurs quatre années de législature; je ne le crois pas, et, si vous voulez toute ma pensée, je ne le veux pas! Si on pouvait seulement s'attacher à une partie du programme et la réaliser, non pas dans un vœu platonique, non pas dans une formule légale, mais dans l'exécution patiente et attentive, et dans le détail de l'administration générale du pays, je m'estimerais suffisamment heureux, et je dirais que les quatre années de législature qui vont s'ouvrir auraient été sagement employées pour le bien du pays. Je prends un seul article de ce programme, celui relatif à l'éducation nationale. C'est là qu'il faut toujours en revenir. . . . C'était le cri que nous poussions au lendemain de nos désastres: nous reconnaissions très-bien que, ce n'était pas seulement la force matérielle qui nous avait vaincus, mais que dans les combinaisons, dans les perfectionnements apportés à l'art de la guerre et aux mille détails qu'elle comporte, la supériorité de l'instruction avait donné l'avantage à nos ennemis, parce que, sur les champs de bataille, comme dans le champ de l'industrie, c'est la force d'esprit qui décide de la victoire. Nous avons réclamé alors ce que je réclame aujourd'hui; c'était le cri unanime, sortant de toutes les poitrines: la Réforme de l'Education Nationale; mais nous n'avons rien obtenu; nous n'avons rien pu arracher; je me trompe, on a obtenu contre nous une loi de division, une loi de recul, une loi de haine, une loi désorganisatrice, une loi d'anarchie morale pour la société française: je veux parler de la loi sur l'enseignement supérieur. Eh bien! messieurs, sans entrer dans les développements que comporterait un si immense sujet, je dis que la tâche urgente, pratique et efficace de nos futurs mandataires doit être *presque uniquement celle de l'organisation, à tous les degrés, au point de vue des écoles, au point de vue des programmes, au point de vue des moyens d'étude, au point de vue financier, doit être d'assurer la constitution de l'éducation nationale*; et si nous voulons véritablement aborder une telle réforme, il n'y en aurait pas d'autre qui dût venir se jeter au travers,

parce que les autres peuvent attendre ou peuvent être résolues plus promptement, et qu'elles ne seront même efficaces que quand celle-là aura réellement fonctionné. Donc, dans la discussion de vos idées, quand vous les soumettez, s'il y a lieu, à vos candidats, attachez-vous à être précis, à ne jamais aborder une question avant une autre, à établir une véritable série mathématique, logique, scientifique, dans les revendications que vous voulez faire prévaloir : demandez d'abord à vos députés d'assurer l'éducation ; le reste, soyez-en convaincus, vous sera donné par surcroît."

This will sound painfully tame to people who have been made drunk by eighty years of utopian potions. The new feature in the present situation is that French liberalism has at length found a leader with true courage. It requires far more courage to talk in this strain, than to denounce tyrants, to promise the millennium, and to march to the guillotine with serenity on the brow and a magnanimous phrase on the lips. Such a policy brings the French revolutionary party into line with the rest of European liberalism, and the momentum which such an accession must add will be immense. For a quarter of a century France has shut herself out from the good cause in Europe. There is now for the first time since 1850 reasonable ground for hoping that her forces will count on the side of progress. France may not contribute many novel ideas in the region of practical politics. Her politicians have much to learn both from England and from America before they can solve their two great problems—not to mention others—of national instruction and administrative decentralisation. Until they have a free press and the free right of meeting, they cannot be considered the chiefs of a really free and self-governing people. But even in the meantime, it will be an immense gain to liberals who are fighting the battle in more prosaic lands to have their principles advocated with the elevation, the dignity of phrase, the high social morality, and above all the strong sympathy for the common people, as profound as it is rational, with which M. Gambetta's recent speeches have surrounded the accepted doctrines of Liberalism all over the western world.

The opening of another session of parliament reminds us among other things how few of our own Liberal chiefs possess the art in which M. Gambetta has shown himself supreme, of making common sense eloquent and inspiring. Parliamentary discussion has been more than usually level. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Lowe made vigorous speeches on the subject of the purchase of the Suez Canal, but the general impression left on the public mind is, that although if they had bought the shares they would certainly have done so in a more careful and business-like way, still that they would never have bought them at all. The Government have introduced a Merchant Shipping Bill which only half satisfies the extreme believers in the efficacy of legislative interference ; and a Bill for the Enclosure of Commons which thoroughly dissatisfies all who are solicitous for the maintenance of popular rights in popular property. The House of Lords by another Government Bill, is to retain the shadow of its name as the court of final appeal. But, when constituted as such a court, it is only to consist of a certain number of professional lawyers, and it is also to receive two Lords



of Appeal, who will be to all intents and purposes life peers. How far this arrangement promotes or serves the dignity of the Upper House, its members may judge for themselves. To the public, provided a step has been taken in the direction of a better constituted judiciary, that kind of dignity which is consulted by the retention of the shadow while parting with the substance, is an object of minor interest.

A subject to which more popular attention has been attracted is the proposal to add to the style of the Sovereign some phrase that shall designate her empire in India. India moves incessantly like some swarthy phantom in the background of our politics. It sometimes advances, sometimes recedes, sometimes stands motionless, but it is always there and its presence is always felt like a portentous shadow. Just now in the eye of popular interest the shadow moves. Mr. Disraeli's bold figure of the chain of fortresses that connect India with the very gates of England, was a more effective way of enabling people to realise our relations to India, than the price which they will have to pay for the last acquired link of the chain that is not a fortress. A new Viceroy is going out, attended by the good wishes of the country and the warm hopes of a troop of friends. The country is interested in the experiment of a ruler over India whose mental habits have been formed among the more varied, flexible, imaginative conditions of continental life and continental diplomacy. The peril of the narrowly absolute and insular type was shown in the mischievous blunder of Lord Lytton's predecessor at Baroda.

A great accountant may be a great man, but he is certainly not always a statesman, and even for the adjustment of fiscal questions, imagination, pliancy, and varied intellectual resource may in certain circumstances do far more valuable work in such a country as India, than the most laborious devotion to the methods of the counting-house. Lord Northbrook has held office for four years. As to his career, in the absence of more than one known occasion for blame, or any marked occasion for praise, the disposition of the English press at present rather turns to eulogy. The eulogy is necessarily vague, because it springs from no full knowledge of the facts. Only the experts can form a really sound opinion, and the experts think less favourably of the retiring Viceroy's achievements. Lord Northbrook has been in India what he was when in office in England, a most careful and industrious administrator. This has perhaps not proved to be quite enough. Lord Northbrook went to India with the idea that the country had been over-governed, and he resolved to pursue a policy of rest and inaction. Contrasted with the energetic and progressive conduct of his predecessor, Lord Northbrook's may be called a policy not merely of inaction but of reaction. With a perfect confidence in his own clear judgment and power of mastering details, he is said to have undertaken to administer single-handed the affairs of a continent almost as large as Europe, though he was necessarily ignorant of its infinite variety of conditions and requirements. The Bengal Famine was the first rough interruption. Its gravity was no doubt much exaggerated; still it was of sufficient magnitude to call out some of the highest powers of statesmanship, both in dealing with the immediate problem, and in framing measures to meet an Indian difficulty of

constant recurrence and ever-increasing perplexity. The main idea of Lord Northbrook's 'famine policy,' if it was statesmanlike, was certainly of a singular simplicity. People are starving; starving people must have food; spend as many millions in buying food as will give plenty to as many mouths as you think fit. It is true that this policy is said to have been urged on Lord Northbrook by the Cabinet at home, as it certainly was urged upon him with the utmost vehemence by the press—a plea, by the way, that does not apply to Lord Northbrook's mischievous perversity in the affair of the Guikwar. And it is true that to Lord Northbrook's excellent qualifications as a man of business we may fairly set down the complete success in detail of the operations for the supply of food; and they were carried out on an enormous scale and in the face of enormous difficulties. But when we talk of statesmanship and policy, we are thinking of a man who is able to judge rightly for himself, for one thing, and who looks to the future, for another thing. Now there has been no evidence that any effective thought was given to the permanent burden that has been laid on the country by the profuse expenditure of 6½ millions within a few months in providing mere temporary relief. No man can measure the financial difficulties that must arise if every season of drought is to be accompanied by this immense and unproductive outlay. Here we have to face the central difficulty of the Indian situation—how to govern an immense, distant, unfamiliar dependency, by a democracy, with Exeter Hall, with a House of Commons containing a fully representative quota of fools, and a press that alternates as to subject races between silly philanthropy and bloodthirsty iniquity. "In the case of India," Mr. Mill said, "a politically active people like the English, amidst habitual acquiescence are every now and then interfering, and almost always in the wrong place. The real causes which determine the prosperity or wretchedness, the improvement or deterioration, of the Hindoos, are too far off to be within their ken. They have not the knowledge necessary for suspecting the existence of these causes, much less for judging of their operation. The most essential interests of the country may be well administered without obtaining any of their approbation, or mismanaged to almost any extent without attracting their notice." This is every day seen to be perfectly true. It is very easy for patriots at Westminster to groan at Mr. Lowe for talking of our having to give up India one day, but if the famine policy for which Lord Northbrook has been so much praised is to be systematically repeated, how is financial ruin to be avoided? For we have to remember that a constantly accumulating burden of debt in India is accompanied by no corresponding development of productive resources; and such a burden may before long readily become a source of even greater difficulty to the government and greater misery to the people, than the very distress which we designed to remedy.

Lord Northbrook's financial policy has on the whole been extremely careful and economical. But here too there has probably been a too exclusive attention to the wants of the immediate present. Some of his latest acts in connection with the customs tariff are before long likely to give rise to sharp criticism. In India the fiscal system is extremely rudimentary. The

land revenue is the only branch of the public income which can properly be said to be based on the wealth of the country, or to be susceptible of development with the increase of public wealth. On the other hand the wants of advancing civilisation are infinite. Looking beyond the mere present, it is impossible not to see that many and serious changes must be made, to place the finances on a really sound basis, and to bring the revenues into the requisite relation with the various sources of public wealth. And the problem is complicated by the strong political pressure by which the Lancashire manufacturers are able to back their protests against at least one profitable item in the Indian tariff. Neither the difficult questions on the North West frontier, nor the difficult questions connected with the native armies, will give the new Viceroy so many sleepless nights and harassing days as the prodigious enigma of Indian finance.

Some elections have taken place, and are worth noticing. Those in the counties have been of various meaning. Take East Suffolk, for instance, where no liberal has sat for forty years. A clergyman who has had a benefice in an eastern county for nearly forty years recently described the deterioration of public life in those parts to the present writer. "The county people," he said, "are withdrawing more and more from political affairs and from everything else except hunting and battues. They don't go into the army, because they fear the examinations. They don't go to India for the same reason. They don't go into electioneering, because they dislike the roughness of it and the necessity of conciliating people whom they regard as dependents." Probably the same is true of other parts of England besides Suffolk. Whether it be true or not that the old possessors of power are becoming indifferent to it, that will not much longer be the case with the new possessors of power.

The success of the tenant farmers in North Shropshire, their revolt in Dorsetshire, the resignation of Mr. Clare Read, are all so many signs that the class which has the election of county members in its hands is beginning to awake. Discontent, accompanied by the growing consciousness of power, is certain to spread very rapidly. The landlords of both parties can no longer count upon the 'fine brute votes' of their tenants. The farmers have hitherto been, and still are in name, Tories almost to a man. They have been devoted followers of the landed gentry, staunch adherents of the Established Church, and bitter opponents of National Education. They have considered the town radicals their natural enemies. They have consistently opposed every proposition which has emanated from the hostile ranks. But if it be once made clear to them that the objects which they are beginning earnestly to desire will have the hearty support of those whom they chose to take for born foes, the whole fabric of their Toryism will receive a shock, and we may yet see Radicals returned to Parliament for English counties in defiance alike of Whig and Tory landlords. The Conservatism of the farmers is based on the supposed interests of the land. Their views on ecclesiastical questions are less the expression of strong and intelligent conviction, than a kind of political log-rolling, by which the various vested interests of the country ally themselves together

for mutual protection. When it is recognised that this alliance has ceased to be mutually advantageous, the tacit compact will be at an end, and new combinations will take its place. When that happens, then those who are best acquainted with the slow workings of the bucolic mind, are tolerably sure that not even the desire to secure the continued presence of 'a cultivated gentleman in every parish,' will be suffered to over-ride more material interests.

It would be premature to count these possibilities as immediately probable. A certain section of the liberals, who have for a long time excused their unwillingness to set the political machinery in motion by interest in its further perfection, declare their anxiety to make the extension of Household Suffrage to the Counties the first object of the whole party. If they succeed, all hopes of an alliance with the farmers may be abandoned. The concession of a share of political power to the agricultural labourers has for their employers all the terrors of the Red Spectre in France. If it be made the first point in a revival of liberal activity, they will give up their hopes of Tenant Right and County boards sooner than accept it. Their prejudice on the subject does not make the extension of the franchise less just or less certain. But it is a fact which may well be taken into consideration by the liberal leaders, whenever they set themselves seriously to determine the order of precedence of the reforms which our generation has to accomplish.

If we turn from the counties to the boroughs, we find that the elections are disclosing the fact which some of us were wholly prepared for, that the thoroughgoing Liberal is gradually edging out the over-cautious Liberal. The great law of Survival of the politically Fittest is operating in the extinction of the timid Whig and the rise of a stronger breed. At Leominster a candidate has been elected who is of the very boldest school of liberalism, and this in the face of a very strong Conservative opponent. The significant circumstance about this election is that the canvassers directed the whole of their efforts to convincing the electors that absolute secrecy was secured. Hitherto the tenants and small people have been very doubtful of this. There is little doubt that 200 voters promised the Tories and then balloted for the Liberal. Immoral enough; but not really more so than the pressure exerted by the other side. And fortunately the new form of immorality will put an end to the old form, and then both will vanish together. At any rate, there is the fact for politicians to take to heart, that the Ballot is winning confidence as a means of really secret voting. At Burnley the successful candidate was chosen by the local liberal leaders in preference to another liberal aspirant, because the latter was of too mild a shade. At Manchester the so-called moderates were anxious to fight the battle not with Mr. Bright, but with Mr. Hibbert. They were overruled, and they now admit that none but an advanced candidate will henceforth be able to rouse the spirit of the effective sections of the party. We do not in the least incline to overrate the significance of these elections in measuring the relative strength of Liberals and Conservatives. That such a candidate as Mr. Powell should secure so solid a vote in a city like Manchester is a warning, along with a hundred other signs, that we are still a long way from the end of the Con-

servative reaction. The moral of what is going on in the country is not that the Conservative feeling is declining, but that when liberalism does revive in the constituencies, it will be something more than the official doctrine contemplates.

There is something really amazing in the complacent blindness with which politicians and journalists persist in ignoring the revolution that was effected by the Reform Act of 1867. The transfer of power from the ten-pounders to all ratepaying householders and to lodgers under certain conditions was none the less a revolution, in spite of the conservative majority which the new rulers of the country elected in 1874. Lord Derby's statement at Edinburgh about the power of the workmen to do what they liked in the legislature, was an overstatement, and will remain one until a redistribution of seats has taken place. How little really representative the present system is, may be illustrated by one circumstance. If there is a single sentiment or opinion in which the working class all over the country is unanimous, it is in hostility to certain unnameable Acts for garrison towns. The sentiment may be a mistake; of its merits we say nothing. But as a plain matter of fact, this is the sentiment not only of the working class, but of the great mass of the dissenters and of evangelical professors generally. Yet the unnameable Acts, whether fortunately or otherwise, remain and for a time at any rate are likely to remain. There can hardly be a more striking instance of the defective representative character of existing arrangements.

Still Lord Derby was certainly nearer the truth than most of his friends and followers. One conservative writer, for instance, wonders that so advanced a liberal as the new member for Manchester should be chosen to fight the battle of "an intelligent unsentimental community of manufacturers and merchants." But the political community is no longer composed of manufacturers and merchants. At the polls they are the least considerable part of the community. Even their power in choosing the candidate is becoming rigorously limited by the necessity of conciliating the opinions, the sentiments, the prejudices of their new masters. The change has not yet made itself profoundly felt, but nothing can hinder its decisive operations within our own life-time. Wise conservatives see the peril. The success of their arch-gambler's first throw does not reassure them. It is as if they saw a friend forsaking sober business for speculation, and exulting in his first thousands. They know that these easy winnings presage beggary. It is quite true that English political instincts are cautious, rather indolent, and averse from argumentation. But our constituencies in their present form and frame of mind, are not at all unlikely to consent to great changes, rather than endure the vexation of having to listen to prolonged disputes about them. They will even concede to importunity, as they have done before now, what they would not concede to the most persuasive demonstration of expediency. The future depends, more than anything else, upon the amount of trouble which the political class will take in training the mass of the new voters. We are not talking of mere literary instruction. That indeed is now an indispensable condition either of progress or stability in any democracy that is more than the worst sort of

oligarchy in disguise. The effective training is training in the discussion, management, and decision of their own civil affairs.

What we need far more than schemes for representing minorities are habits that will stimulate the political education of majorities. And these can only be formed locally and in local centres. Mr. Grant Duff made a suggestive observation at Elgin the other day. "I confess," he said, "I often feel sad to see men drearily circulating through the division lobbies, content to be mere pawns in the game which is played by others, when they could be so infinitely greater as well as more useful, by standing on their own individual importance and administering their wealth for noble ends." (Feb. 5.) This far-seeing remark covers more than the mere administration of wealth, and applies to other people besides capitalists. To be a great citizen may one day seem a higher aim than to be a small member of parliament, and good citizenship is capable of many forms much more important and far-reaching than even the bestowal of munificent endowments. One of these forms is to assist in the task of officering our democracy; of instructing and interesting them first about the affairs that lie at their doors, and then about the greater affairs; of accustoming them to think about good government and good laws. This cannot be done by means of a course of twelve lectures on political economy. Action is the only education: action and responsibility for your opinions being true. And this action must be something very different from the mere giving of a vote once in five years. Political interest needs regular stimulation—not by the continual agitation of 'blazing principles,' but by furnishing many opportunities to members of every class for social action on a scale where they can see and understand what kind of difference their action makes. The wage-receiving classes are for the most part shut out by the unalterable conditions of their life from seats on administrative and deliberative boards. They have not the time, and even if School Boards and Town Councils were foolish enough to hold their sessions in the evening, as the House of Commons does, a workman who was at the mill or the foundry at six in the morning, and has been engaged in exhausting work in a heated atmosphere all day, is hardly in the humour for public accounts, estimates, and balance sheets at night. But the workmen are perfectly capable of being interested in the broad and general aspects of public business. "I have often been impressed at our country town meetings," Mr. Emerson has recently said, "with the accumulated ability in each village of 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 men who speak so well and so easily handle the affairs of the town. I often hear the business of a little town (with which I am most familiar) discussed with a clearness and thoroughness, and with a *generosity*, too, that would have satisfied me had it been in one of the larger capitals." England will hardly give so good an account as the United States, until our schools have had time to become a more important force, but even now the sound sense and the "generosity" of the people who go to ward-meetings and town-meetings will compare favourably with the same qualities in gatherings of greater pretensions. But the army needs officers, and it depends on the activity, self-denial, and sense of those who have disinterested public

spirit and intelligence, whether the function of officership shall be performed by them, or by a selfish and low-minded class of professional politicians.

So far as legislation goes, there is only one way of attracting the best members of the middle class into some more effective participation in public business than occasional attendance at a caucus for choosing a parliamentary candidate. This way is to make local governing bodies more important. The more interesting and important the functions of an assembly, the better the quality of the intelligence that is likely to come to it. One reason why the House of Representatives at Washington has so small a share of the best men in the country, compared even with our House of Commons, is that its business is so much less important to America than the business of the House of Commons is to England. The State legislatures pre-occupy an immense department of governmental action, and they do their work as a rule intelligently enough. With us, there will be plenty of important work left for the central Parliament, after there has been an increase of the attributions of the local parliaments. At present, there is no unwillingness in the legislature to remit questions to be decided by local authorities. But then parliament seems half afraid of its own policy, and its conception of permissive legislation, wholesome as it is in one respect, is extremely weak and vicious in another. The true principle of all legislation of this kind is to leave to local bodies no alternative in the application of a given measure, but the widest possible discretion in the manner of its administration. Again, one of the most excellent steps for the improvement of local bodies would be to concentrate in one of them the functions that are now dispersed among several. The Town Council performs one set of duties, the Board of Guardians another set, the School Board a third, the Licensing Magistrates a fourth, the Governors of an Endowed School a fifth. There may possibly have been good reasons for this dispersion of offices, when they were first devised. It is hard to see what reasons are now to be urged against their union in a single local parliament, a representative body with powers for all the local purposes of the neighbourhood. At present, though the Council of a great town may in a single year authorise the expenditure of as large a sum as the government of the country has given for half of the Suez Canal, yet the work of the Council of an ordinary corporation hardly exceeds the business of a small contractor. If you added to this the work of the School Board, another set of persons would be interested in watching its proceedings; the administration of the Poor Laws would attract others; the control of the public-houses, and the administration of any local endowments, would do the same. In a body of this kind, among its many other advantages, we could count upon finding feeling enough for good government and the public weal, to counterbalance that penuriousness of the smaller rate-payer which is so natural considering his circumstances, and yet is so threatening an impediment in the way of social improvement.

*February 25, 1876.*

THE  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

NO. CXII. NEW SERIES.—APRIL 1, 1876.

SPIRITUALISM AND MATERIALISM.

PART I.

“Die theoretischen Irrthümer meist mehr darauf beruhen dass man die Erklärungsgründe aus andern Gebiete der Naturwissenschaften übertragend auf den Organismus anwandte.”—JOHANNES MÜLLER, *Ueber die phantastischen Gesichtsercheinungen*, 1826, p. 3.

ALTHOUGH the controversy between the two conceptions of the world, known as Spiritualism and Materialism, still rages, and is likely to rage for many years, the conceptions themselves are incessantly being modified, and approaching nearer and nearer to a common agreement, as each party recognises what is strong in the positions of its adversary. While the spiritualist has been forced by the advances of physiological science to assign a larger and larger place to the operation of material conditions in the production of mental phenomena, the materialist has been forced by the same advance of science to recognise the existence of conditions entirely different from those classed as material. But there is still on the one side the terrified repugnance at whatever bears the name of Matter, and on the other the contemptuous rejection of whatever claims the character of Spirit. There is still the radical separation between the conceptions of Creation and Evolution in the explanation of the Cosmos; and between the conceptions of *metaphysiology*, and physiology in the explanation of Life and Mind. Standing apart from these contending schools, there is a third school, small indeed, but important, which rejects the theories of both, or rather which disengages what seems valid in each, and by a new interpretation reconciles their differences.

I do not propose here to discuss the Cosmic question, but will merely note in passing that modern philosophy has completely revolutionised it by showing that the broadest of all distinctions—that of Object and Subject, or of Matter and Mind—does not demand a corresponding opposition in their substrata, but simply the logical



distinction of aspects: so that one and the same group of phenomena is objectively expressible in terms of Matter and Motion, and subjectively in terms of Feeling. Matter ceases to be an alien, ceases to have the dead unspiritual character, when we learn that everything we can possibly know of it is one of the many modes of Feeling. All our knowledge of it is our knowledge of our own affections. Our inferences respecting it as Notsself are but the hypothetical representations of the possible modes of Feeling which the Notsself would excite in us under conceivable changes of relation. Having classed experiences and inferences under the general heads of Matter and Motion, and thus formed conceptions of objects and forces, we endeavour to range the unclassified modes under similar rubrics, and thus explain the occurrence of some given change of Feeling by the conjunction of other modes, known and inferred. For example, we say that the change named Colour is the effect of a conjunction of the specific pulsations of an undulating medium on a specific nerve-terminal, followed by a specific excitation in a nerve centre. In one aspect this process is from first to last a material process—*i.e.* an objective process. But in another aspect it is equally a mental or subjective process. Ideally, and for our convenience, we dissociate the objective from the subjective aspect; but when we suppose that a real separation corresponds with this ideal distinction, we are thrown back upon the mystery of how a material process can become a mental process, how vibrations become sensations. The mystery is an illusion. There is no such transformation. What is called the material process is simply the objective aspect of the subjective mental process. Examine the material terms "vibration," "external medium," "impinging," "nerve-terminal," "nerve-centre," and "excitation," they are one and all translatable in terms of Feeling; and only thus are they significant: every sensible having its corresponding sensation. Strip the objective terms of all their subjective values, and you leave them as the unknown *x*. But in saying that Matter cannot be dissociated from Mind, we are not relinquishing our belief in the Reality which is not ourselves; we are only affirming that the perceptions and conceptions which Philosophy employs as its materials in the construction of theories, are under one aspect material—*i.e.* objective—under another aspect mental—*i.e.* subjective; and that the business of the philosopher is to systematize the conceptions, and recognise the logical distinction of their aspects.

In systematizing the conceptions respecting the organism and its actions, we must hold fast to the teachings of Experience; and all our inferences which transcend or run before actual sensation, must be modelled on Experience. Now it is a fact of Experience that Feeling and Thought stand in such direct contrast with Matter

and Force—the symbols represent concretes so markedly unlike—that there is the greatest difficulty in recognising identity of existence under such diversity of aspect. Starting from this fact of difference, the spiritualist hypothesis invokes a corresponding diversity in the substrata: it postulates the existence of a spiritual entity which is *in* the material organism but not *of* it; somewhat as the dwarf was inside Kempelen's automaton chessplayer. The body it regards as a machine which is set going by a machinist who watches and regulates its movements. This machinist has been variously conceived as Vital Principle, or Soul; although directly known through consciousness, it is nevertheless an inscrutable mystery, and its mode of operation in determining organic movements can never be detected. The materialist hypothesis of molecular movements becoming transformed into Feeling is not simply repugnant, it is inconceivable—the gulf between Motion and Feeling being unbridgeable. Nay, does not the materialist himself proclaim the passage to be an insoluble mystery?

So long as the old Dualism of Matter and Mind is not resolved into the dual aspect of objective and subjective, the intellectual difficulty here emphasised will sustain the spiritualist hypothesis. And to this intellectual repugnance there is added a moral repugnance. Many who reject the hypothesis of a Vital Principle as a scientific encumbrance, thwarting instead of aiding research, cling to the equivalent hypothesis of a Psychical Principle, not only as an aid but as a sanction. With an honourable though unwise dread of losing in this hypothesis a great sanction of Morality, they cling to it in the face of evidence, and prefer the ignorance which offers the sanction a basis, to any knowledge which threatens its acceptance. Could they once see that after all Materialism is only an hypothesis, and one which, whether true or false, can in no way alter the facts it is invented to link together, they would admit that while their repugnance may be rational on the intellectual side, it is irrational on the moral side. Our moral life has, happily, no such insecure basis as that of a speculative conception. Nor would the existence of a spiritual Principle, could it be demonstrated, help us to understand, and understanding modify, the facts of moral life. A superficial observation suffices to show how incapable such a Principle must be of generating moral conduct; since so many souls exhibit a deplorable insensibility to moral duties. Every one acquainted with prisons and lunatic asylums knows that there are beings in whom what is called the "moral sense" is irremediably deficient. Nor is this observation impugned by referring to the effect of bad Education; since such an argument implies that Morality depends more on Education than on the Psychical Principle. And if it be said that criminals and cretins are what we see because of their "defec-

tive organizations," this also implies that the organization, and not the Principle, is the basis of moral life, and that to it our study must be directed.<sup>1</sup>

Before proceeding to examine the validity of either the spiritualist or the materialist hypothesis, let me beg the reader to clear his mind, if possible, of the irrelevant considerations which have been suffered to crowd round and obscure the question. The spiritualist, it is notorious, claims for his hypothesis the consecration of "our holiest instincts and our loftiest aspirations"—a claim which may well excite sympathy and hope, and place antagonists at a disadvantage; but on investigation the claim turns out to be a preposterous assumption. He relies on it to stigmatize all opposition as false, because degrading: not, be it observed, degrading because false! He relies on it to proclaim that opponents deny all the spiritual facts, deny moral responsibility, disinterestedness, and ideal aims. On this ground he considers no words too vituperative to be flung at those who criticize his hypothesis; no conclusions too absurd to be attributed to his opponents. Thus for years Materialism has been a term of reproach; and most men have been eager to disavow their sympathy with an opinion at once so "shallow" and so "despicable."

Self-laudation and abuse of antagonists are rhetorical devices which one cannot hope to see disused—in our days at least. But the rhetoric of many spiritualists is very distasteful to serious minds, aware that the materialist no more denies the facts of Conscience, in discrediting the hypothesis of their being the products of a spirit, than the Berkleyan, in rejecting the ordinary hypothesis of an external Matter, denies the facts of Existence. We have no more right to expect that the materialist will run counter to moral obligations, than that the idealist will run his head against the lamp-post; although both these preposterous conclusions have been gravely "deduced" by opponents.

Both Spiritualism and Materialism have much that is plausible, and much that is defective. Each successfully links together certain important facts, and fixes attention on fundamental points. But each commits the common sin against Scientific Method of overlooking the artificial nature of Analysis; and thus assigns to a single factor the product which obviously results from many. Each is misled by the desire to find one simple cause for a complex effect; which is in flagrant disregard of the fundamental principle of causation. Moreover each is open to the charge of incomplete observation. Inferences are allowed to take the place of facts; and facts

(1) In saying this I am confining the question within the limits of the individual organization, without reference to the social medium in which that organization lives, and from which so large a part of the moral life arises.

which cannot be explained by the hypothesis are left out of sight. The spiritualist relies upon an inference which no observation ever could verify—the existence of a spirit; and the materialists rely on inferences which no observation ever did verify—the existence of “vital properties” in electricity, or of thought as “a property inherent in brain-substance.”

It is probable that some readers will dissent from the assertion that both hypotheses have much in their favour; but that dissent will vanish if they consider how eminent have been the upholders of each. It is never wise to assume that an antagonist is a fool merely because he holds what seems to us a foolish opinion. It is not foolish to him; and we should do well to understand how this is so. To refute an opinion we must understand it; and we cannot understand the aspect it presents to his mind unless we place ourselves at his standpoint. If from that point we can see what he sees, and see more, we may hope to enlarge his vision; never by denying what he sees.

Although my tone of thought is profoundly opposed to that of Spiritualism, I can conscientiously say that no effort has been wanting on my part to seek out its strongest arguments in the works of all the great teachers. Indeed there was one brief period when I was very near a conversion. The idea of a noumenal Mind, as something distinct from mental phenomena—a something diffused through the organism giving unity to Consciousness, very different from the unity of a machine, flashed upon me one morning with a sudden and novel force, quite unlike the shadowy vagueness with which it had heretofore been conceived. For some minutes I was motionless in a rapt state of thrilled surprise. I seemed standing at the entrance of a new path, leading to new issues with a vast horizon. The convictions of a life seemed tottering. A tremulous eagerness, suffused with the keen delight of discovery, yet mingled with cross-lights and hesitations, stirred me; and from that moment I have understood something of sudden conversions. There was, as I afterwards remembered, no feeling of distress at this prospect of parting with old beliefs. Indeed it is doubtful whether sudden conversions are accompanied by pain, the excitement is too great, the new ideas too absorbing. The rapture of truth overcomes the false shame of having been in error. The one desire is for more light.

The intense and prolonged meditation which followed, affected my health. I re-read the writings of the great thinkers on the spiritualist side, doing my utmost to keep in abeyance the old objections and hesitations which continually surged up, and trying to keep my mind open to all the force of argument which could be urged. But the light flickered as I moved. The old trains of thought would recur, with the physiological evidence which could not be disputed. Instead of gaining

conviction from the writings of metaphysicians, the more I studied them, the more the darkness gathered; till finally I returned to my starting-point, and began to re-examine it. This was the result: I saw that the distinction between a noumenal Mind and mental phenomena was a purely logical distinction transformed into a real distinction; it was the separation of an abstraction from its concretes, such as we make when we separate the abstraction substance from concrete qualities, and this separation, effected logically, we erect into a real distinction by substantialising the abstraction, which is then supposed to precede and produce the concretes from which it is raised. The noumenal Mind had thus no more warrant than a Machine Principle apart from all machines, or a Vital Principle apart from vital phenomena.

Although the spiritualist hypothesis had thus again lost all plausibility for me, I had gained at least the conviction that its persistence in the face of advancing science, and its acceptance by minds of great power, was not without justification as a protest against mechanical conceptions, and an insistence on the need of a synthetic explanation. I felt, as I had never fully felt before, its value as a reaction against the too-confident and precipitate attempts to reduce vital and mental phenomena to physical and chemical laws, without due regard to the speciality of conditions which characterize organic phenomena. Henceforward I could sympathize with the spiritualist in his belief that Life and Mind are of a quite different order from anything seen in the heavens, or in the laboratory—an order seen only in the organic series. But this made me more anxious to ascertain wherein the difference began—the speciality of the conditions which the organic series involved. And here I could not take a step with the spiritualist when he sought a cause lying outside the organism, and propounded an hypothesis which by its very terms transcended all verification. There was no illumination from the rebaptism of the observed phenomena, under the terms Vital Principle, Soul, and Spirit. Nor did the more serious spiritualists profess to know what this transcendental agent really was, they only held fast to the assertion that it was not Matter. And while they were satisfied to proclaim it the unknown cause of the known effects (in accordance with the false though generally accepted notion of causation)—most of them were willing to declare an equal ignorance in regard to Matter. Thus thinkers so various as Voltaire, Condillac, Hume, Kant, Reid, and Hamilton declared their impartial ignorance of Mind and Matter, while affirming confidently that Mind could have no community with Matter. Clearly there was some deep-seated ambiguity in the terms thus used.

The ambiguity appears directly the question descends to particulars. It is a common tendency of disputants to caricature the opinions they

oppose, and thus appear to gain an easy triumph over an adversary shown in an absurd light. The spiritualist presents his adversary as holding that Life and Mind are "manifestations of ordinary Matter—" by which is meant that Life is manifested by inert, lifeless carths, crystals, or gases; and Mind by "blind unconscious Matter." But although materialists have much to answer for, they never talked nonsense like this. They never supposed that ordinary Matter lived and felt. They affirmed that only organized Matter lived, and only organized animals felt. Whatever incompleteness may belong to their conception of the material conditions involved, they had at least this manifest superiority, that they endeavoured to express the observed facts in terms of Experience, and refused to postulate an unknowable agent.

The real battle-ground is this: In seeking an explanation of the phenomena of Life and Mind, are we to construct it from the observed facts and known laws, filling up the gaps of observation by inferences which themselves have a sensible basis and admit of verification, so that hypotheses may conform to scientific canons, and represent sensible or extra-sensible Experience? or are we to pass beyond the sphere of possible observation, and invoke an agency which never was, never could be sensible, nor expressed in terms of Experience?

Those who choose the first alternative are classed as materialists; those who choose the latter are spiritualists. But here a further subdivision is necessary. As there are many opponents of Materialism, who, nevertheless, emphatically reject the hypothesis of a Spirit, replacing it by the substantialised abstraction of an Idea, or Plan; so likewise there are opponents of Spiritualism who reject the physico-chemical hypothesis of Life, and the hypothesis of Thought being the property of cerebral cells—they are to be distinguished from the materialists by their synthetic attitude, which embraces all the co-operant factors. These latter may be specially designated as organicists, since it is to the organism (with all that term involves) that they refer every organic phenomenon. Of course the various opinions on each side blend insensibly, so that one can seldom sharply define all the views of a particular thinker. But the two schools are broadly distinguishable as the extra-organic, and the organic, or as the metaphysiological, and the physiological. When I said just now that I rejected the materialist hypothesis, I referred of course to the imperfect form which the physiological interpretation often assumes; but in so far as Materialism is identified with the physiological interpretation, and rejects the *metaphysiological*, I heartily accept it.

## THE METAPHYSIOLOGICAL HYPOTHESIS.

It will have been remarked, perhaps, that hitherto our remarks have blended Life and Soul interchangeably, although in some systems these are made two distinct Principles. Here the main interest lies in the question of Method; and in this respect whether Life be identified with, or separated from Mind, is quite unimportant.

The ancients believed the organism to be an inert machine animated by three Principles—the vegetative, sensitive, and rational souls. Aristotle and his followers reduced the three to one; but modern metaphysicians and metaphysiologists have been staggered by the impropriety of assigning Secretion, Digestion, &c., to the spiritual agent active in Thought and Will;<sup>1</sup> they have been also impressed with the impropriety of assigning vital powers to lifeless Matter; and they have hoped to reconcile all difficulties by endowing the organism with two spiritual principles essentially distinct, one for vital, the other for mental processes. Only by the aid of extra-organic agents, said they, can the phenomena be intelligible, since physical and chemical processes fail to render them intelligible. Moreover, the unity of vital phenomena was said to claim imperiously “an unique principle, an unique cause of all organic functions, and even the formation of the organs themselves.”<sup>2</sup> This favourite argument has no validity. To demand an unique cause for Life, on the ground of the phenomena thus grouped in one expression, is to misconceive the nature of causation, and the nature of the complex effects. No one thinks of extending such an argument to the *American Republic*, or the *German Nation*, which are also unities.

Although now fallen into general discredit, Animism seems to me more logically consistent than Vitalism. If an extra-organic agent is to be postulated as the generator and regulator of organic phenomena, one such agent will suffice both for physiological and psychological processes; the more so since the psychological obviously arise from the physiological. But metaphysicians carrying out their analytical separations, and substantialising the results of such analysis, not only come to believe in the real distinction between Mind and Life, but also in the real distinction between the Action and the Agent; and this logical artifice thus endowed with reality leads to the postulate of an Animating Principle which is some-

(1) Here are two out of a multitude of passages which might be cited:—“Je ne comprends pas qu'on puisse mettre un cataplasme sur l'âme; mon spiritualisme se révolte à l'idée que mon âme puisse être influencée par des hémorrhoides au rectum, ou bien par une rétention d'urine.”—Amédée Latour, *Revue Médicale*, 31st August, 1860.

“Une âme qui sécrète l'urine vous paraît-elle moins dégoûtante qu'un cerveau qui sécrète la pensée?”—Pidoux, *De la nécessité du Spiritualisme pour régénérer les sciences médicales*, 1857, p. 70.

(2) Boullier, *Du Principe Vital*, 1862, p. 4.

thing essentially different from the Organism.<sup>1</sup> It is on this path they have found more and more reasons for separating groups of phenomena, and after detaching the Life from the Body, have detached Mind from Sense, because Sense obviously involved bodily organs and material stimuli; and restricted Mind to Thought and Will, these seeming to be rescued from all participation in material conditions.<sup>2</sup>

Spiritualism, having thus rescued Thought and Will from every material implication, in proof of the position that it is the Soul which determines vital phenomena, urges the undisputed fact that Thought and Will exercise a marked influence on the bodily functions. The counter-argument is, however, more effective in its insistence on the not less indisputable fact that the bodily functions influence mental states—a fact which Spiritualism vainly tries to evade by declaring it to be a “mystery;” but which is more rationally interpretable as due to the interdependence of organic phenomena, among which Thought and Will take their place. When we observe doses of alcohol or morphia raising or depressing the mental activity, just as tightening or slackening a cord increases or decreases the rapidity of its vibrations—when we observe an arrested secretion deepening the gloom, or a fluttering of the heart awakening the fears,—when we observe that a suicidal tendency can be arrested by opium, returning whenever the opium is no longer given, it is idle to reject this evidence of the dependence of mental states on physiological conditions, and ask us to accept instead, the conclusion that the facts are mysterious. Mysterious perhaps; but the mystery proves no extra-organic agency.

Nor is there any real gain in placing the mystery in a Soul, which manifests itself through the vehicle of a Body, using the Body as a

(1) “I am visionary enough to imagine,” said Abernethy, “that if once philosophers saw reason to believe that life was something of an invisible and active nature super-added to organization, they would then see equal reason to believe that mind might be superadded to life, as life is to structure. They would then, indeed, still farther perceive how mind and matter might reciprocally operate on each other by means of an intervening substance.”—*Inquiry into the Probability and Rationality of Mr. Hunter's Theory of Life*, 1814, p. 94.

(2) Maine de Biran not only excludes all vital functions from the soul, or *le Moi*, but even Sensibility, with all the faculties dependent on it, “l'imagination, les reproductions ou associations fortuites d'images ou de signes, enfin tout ce qui se fait passivement ou nécessairement en nous.” (*Rapports du Physique et du Moral*). And enumerating elsewhere the rejected phenomena he says that whatever belongs to the organism belongs to the physical nature: “Des affections immédiates de plaisir ou de douleur; des attractions sympathiques ou des répugnances inhérentes au tempérament primitif ou confondus avec lui et devenus irrésistibles par l'habitude; des images qui se produisent spontanément dans l'organisme cérébral, et qui tantôt persistent opiniâtrément, tantôt se réveillent avec les paroxysmes de telles maladies ou désordres nerveux, les mouvements violents, brusques et précipités que ces passions entraînent, soit que le moi de l'homme étant absorbé n'y prenne aucune part, soit qu'il y assiste comme témoin, les appétits, les penchans, ces déterminations, ces idées qui suivent nécessairement la direction du physique, tout cela est hors du domaine moral.”—*Œuvres*, iii. 362; ed. Naville.



musician does his instrument, the imperfections of the instrument being perceptible in the music, but in nowise implicating the powers of the performer. No doubt, if there were any evidence for this hypothesis, such an interpretation would be accepted. But where is the evidence that the Body is only an instrument played upon by the Soul? There is absolutely none. It is brought forward in avowed ignorance of the causal connection. We have not on the one hand knowledge of the Spirit and its powers, on the other of the Body and its properties, comparable with our knowledge of the musician and the instrument, so that we can explain the action of the one on the other. All we positively know is the changes in the body; and because we do not understand how material changes can produce vital and mental phenomena, we assume the co-operation of something not material; the more so because Matter and Mind are mutually exclusive conceptions. But here again it is the ambiguity of terms which creates the difficulty. By a logical artifice we have isolated Matter from Mind—that is the Felt from Feeling—and having established this contrast, cannot recognise the artifice. That mental phenomena are not material phenomena, is asserted in the very terms which are employed. In the same sense chemical phenomena are not physical; nor vital phenomena chemical; nor moral phenomena mechanical; nor political phenomena domestic. But these necessary artificial distinctions expressed in language must be taken for what they are worth. They do not affect the reality of all phenomena whatever being changes of the Felt, when objectively viewed, and changes of Feeling, when subjectively viewed. The Matter, of which spiritualists speak so scornfully, is but an abstraction. Matter, the real, with which we have to deal, is saturated with Mind, since it is the Felt.

When we are told that “vital phenomena cannot be accounted for by any known laws” there is a similar ambiguity. True that they have not been sufficiently observed, analysed, and classified, to have disclosed their constants (laws) except in general outlines; it is true therefore, that existing knowledge of organic laws is insufficient to account for many vital phenomena. But this limitation, which every biologist acknowledges, is by the spiritualist turned into the assertion that the *known* laws of Matter being incompetent to explain the facts, *unknown* laws of Spirit alone can be competent. They might as well invoke unknown laws of Spirit to explain the at present inexplicable facts of Astronomy, Physics, and Chemistry. Barclay quotes a passage from the chemist Chaptal which lays the whole stress on the position that the “principle of life presents to us phenomena which chemistry never could have known or predicted by attending to the invariable laws observed in inanimate bodies.”<sup>1</sup>

(1) Barclay, “Life and Organization,” 1822, p. 388.

This is true, but irrelevant. No chemical phenomena could be predicted by attending to the invariable laws observed in Astronomy ; no meteorological phenomena could be predicted by attending to the laws of Optics and Acoustics. To predict phenomena we must take into view all their co-operant conditions. And it is because the materialist fails to take these into view that he hopes by Chemistry to explain phenomena that involve more than chemical conditions. But this error is not rectified by the spiritualist who seeks outside the organism for a principle superadded to the material conditions.

There is no force in the arguments respecting the impossibility of conceiving Matter endowed with vital properties, and the impossibility with our present resources of making organized substances. There is indeed a logical necessity to draw a broad line of demarcation between vital and chemical phenomena. But while we refuse to interpret organized Matter by the possibilities of ordinary Matter, we reject the suggestion that vitality is "an undiscovered form of force having no connection with primary energy or motion." (Beale.) Again and again we must say that there is absolutely no evidence for the existence of an extra-organic agent which is "temporarily associated with matter," and which "governs not only the present changes Matter is to undergo, but prepares it in advance for changes which are to occur at a future time." What is "temporarily associated with Matter"—if the metaphor be allowed—is not a force which is prescient of the future, not a force which is unallied with energy or motion, not a force which is something different from mass-acceleration, but a force which is the directed energy of a particular state of matter named organization. That vital phenomena depend on the changes in organized matter, we have positive evidence; that they depend on an extra-organic agent, or on a "force" which has not matter for its mass, there is absolutely no evidence.

Evidence? For the most part spiritualists reject what we should call evidence, and rely on "intuitions" as of far deeper validity. This remark does not apply to Dr. Beale, who, although rejecting the doctrine of a Vital Principle, in its earlier forms, insists on a "vital force" as the necessary conclusion to which his microscopical researches lead. It is assuredly from no levity, from no ignorance of what physiologists have done, from no want of patient investigation on his own part, that Dr. Beale adopts the *metaphysiological* view. It is the mirage of "germinal matter" which sustains his conviction of the Power or Force wherewith he replaces the traditional Spirit, Archæus, Nisus Formativus, or Plan. This mysterious and undefined Force is said to "influence the particles of Matter, though it bears neither a qualitative, nor, as far as can be at present proved, a quantitative relation to the matter." Such a conception of a "power transmitted to new particles without loss or diminution in

intensity, and sometimes with actual increase," is so conspicuously not a conception which falls in with what in all other sciences is meant by force, that he may well insist on it as *sui generis*. We must relinquish all that we have learned in Physics and Chemistry, and throw overboard all dynamical principles, before we can accept this force. But if Dr. Beale has any evidence which can prove the existence of such a force, we shall admit that it is not only different from ordinary force, but "capable of directing matter and force,"<sup>1</sup> paradoxical as such statements sound. Meanwhile, in the absence of the needed evidence, all we can say is that, while departing from the scientific conception of Force, he has not given such precision to his 'own as enables us to understand what it precisely symbolizes for him. He leaves it in a metaphysical mist, to be seen according to the disposition of the seer.

Many readers, who will be quite ready to give up the meta-physiological view of Life, will be quite unprepared to give up the Psychical Principle as the source and substance of all mental phenomena. They may accept Cuvier's explanation that Life is simply the term which expresses a group of phenomena,<sup>2</sup> but they will not acknowledge that Mind is equally a symbol, the objective concretes of which are to be sought in organic processes. This arises from the dissociation of Life and Mind, which has enabled the psychologist to feel at ease in studying mental phenomena solely on the Introspective Method. Physiology might, it was held, be useful in elucidating Sensation, but could throw no light on Thought. And even Flourens fancied that he had proved experimentally the distinction between Life and Mind, when he proved that the removal of the brain abolished the manifestations of Intelligence without abolishing those of Life. But this was a fallacy. No experiment was needed to prove what stares every one in the face, namely, that the manifestations grouped as Intelligence are specifically different from those grouped as Nutrition, Secretion, &c.; consequently that there must be corresponding difference in their conditions. But to argue from this that there is in Intelligence a distinct Principle which is not the resultant of organic processes, would only have been acceptable had there been evidence of Intelligence away from all organisms.

The spiritualistic hypothesis assumes so many forms, from the crude form of a Spirit inhabiting the body, to the subtle form of

(1) Introduction to Todd and Bowman's Physiology, pp. 35, 92.

(2) "L'idée de la vie est une de ces idées générales et obscures produites en nous par certaines suites de phénomènes que nous voyons se succéder dans un ordre constant, et se tenir par des rapports mutuels. Quoique nous ignorions la nature du lien qui les unit, nous sentons que ce lien doit exister, et cela nous suffit pour nous les faire désigner par un nom que bientôt le vulgaire regarde comme le signe d'un principe particulier, quoiqu'en effet ce nom ne puisse jamais indiquer que l'ensemble des phénomènes qui ont donné lieu à sa formation."—Cuvier, *Anatomie Comparée*.

a substantialised abstraction, that it is difficult to deal with it in a single chapter ; the arguments which refute one writer are powerless against another. At present the hypothesis of a spirit, or special "soul substance," gains little credit. It is generally replaced by a metaphysical abstraction. Thus, Lotze, who has victoriously refuted the idea of a Vital Principle, reproduces the Leibnitzian idea of a parallelism between mental and physical processes, as two series essentially distinct though simultaneous, and mutually conditioned. The elder Fichte declares the soul to be a Process not a Fact (*eine Thathandlung nicht eine Thatsache*) ; and the younger Fichte reproduces this, when declaring the soul to have only a dynamical not a physical existence. From this it is but a step to the organicist hypothesis, which regards the Soul not as a substance, but as a logical subject. The subject is determined by its predicates—is, indeed, nothing but their synthesis. Hence the nature of the Soul is to be sought in the concrete facts of Consciousness ; and since these facts are only known in dependence on organic conditions, it is irrational to seek beyond the organism, and its relations to the medium, for the causes of these concrete facts.

The central position of Spiritualism when, ceasing to urge its negative arguments, it advances positive arguments, is that Consciousness emphatically declares Mind to be something essentially distinct from Matter, and declares it to be simple not composite.

There is a sense in which both these statements are indisputable. Mind and Matter are two abstract symbols, expressive of contrasted aspects ; the one symbolizes all the facts of Feeling, the other all the facts of the Felt. They are as mutually exclusive as Pleasure and Pain. The materialist accepts these distinctions without hesitation. They do not affect his hypothesis that mental phenomena are organic phenomena, and that organic phenomena when objectively considered belong to the objective class named Matter ; consequently that all the canons of research which apply to the class of objective facts apply to the facts of Life and Mind, whatever special character the facts may present.

It is a mistake to suppose that Consciousness directly tells us that Mind is not a group of organic phenomena. Consciousness tells us directly of nothing but itself ; says nothing of how it came to be, of what conditions it is the result. Only reflective analysis can help us here ; and that shows an inseparable twofold aspect, objective and subjective, in every feeling. It shows that here as elsewhere the concrete facts are symbolized in a general term, which by a natural illusion is transformed into an independent existence ; and although we no longer believe in abstract Virtue, or in a Nation which is not the aggregate of its members, we have difficulty in recognising the Mind as an abstraction.

And there is a good reason for this. There is no national consciousness equivalent to the individual consciousness, because there is no national unity equivalent to the individual unity. Each man may feel himself a part of the Nation, and recognise that his acts belong to the national action ; but there is no national consciousness reflected in and guiding his acts ; whereas the human consciousness is reflected in and guides every individual's acts. In other words, the Nation has no consciousness of Self. It is on this "sense of personality" that Spiritualism relies. Nor am I disposed to under-rate its value, since it was this which nearly converted me. But without pausing here to trace the genesis of this Self-consciousness, it is enough to point out that so far from being an initial principle, it is a very late product of evolution. It arises through the slowly-evolved consensus of the organism, and the syntheses of experience. This is shown in those abnormal cases familiar to students of mental pathology, in which the disturbance of the organic connexus leads to a "double consciousness," or to a "changed personality." The patient refuses to recognise his own voice and his own person as belonging to himself. "Une idée des plus étranges," said one of M. Krishaber's patients, "mais qui m'obsède et s'impose à mon esprit malgré moi, c'est de me croire double. Je sens un moi qui pense et un moi qui exécute ; je perds alors le sentiment de la réalité du monde et je ne sais pas si je suis le moi qui pense ou le moi qui exécute."<sup>1</sup>

Without wishing to ignore the strength of the argument which Spiritualism derives from the invocation of Consciousness, I will here merely add that all the facts admit of a better interpretation on the organicist hypothesis ; but this cannot be shown until we have endeavoured by analysis to trace the evolution of the idea of Self.

Before passing to the consideration of Materialism it may be well to glance at the position taken up by the Agnostics, who evade all the difficulties of the question by a declaration of its lying beyond science. These thinkers, starting from the supposed axiom that causes are unknowable, only effects being knowable, urge that whatever may be the nature of the Vital Force, or the Psychical Principle, there is no occasion for science to moot the question. The phenomena are alone cognisable ; it is with them alone that Science concerns itself, leaving to Ontology the phantom-search after causes. Our search should be not for the unknown *x*, but its known functions.<sup>2</sup>

The reader of "Problems of Life and Mind" will understand in

(1) Krishaber, *De la Névropathie Cérébrocardiaque*, 1873, p. 46. There are many other examples in this work, and indeed in most general works on Insanity.

(2) Compara Barthez, *Nouvelle Science de l'Homme*, 1806.

how far I agree with and in how far I should restrict this statement. I have argued for the necessity of science limiting its research to known functions, refusing to admit into its equations any unknown quantities, even when these are postulated ; but I have also endeavoured to show that the supposed axiom of causes not being knowable, when their effects are known, is a fallacy, and a misapprehension of the nature of causation ; it is plausible only through the metaphysical postulate that the cause is something different from its effects—something which is itself the unknown quantity ; and then, indeed, the assertion that one cannot know the cause is a truism. I admit that the special conditions which constitute the state of organization are at present very imperfectly known, and may therefore be expressed by the symbol  $x$ , or by the familiar symbols Vital Force, Vitality, &c. But to the same extent we are ignorant of the special effects. Our knowledge of the functions is very imperfect and vague ; it is daily becoming more precise, and with each precision there emerges a greater clearness as to the conditions or causes. Nor will there be any clearer insight gained into these by postulating an unknown  $x$  as their agent. The agnostic is no better off than the spiritualist, except that he only pretends to explain the facts observed by means of sensible experiences, and does not suffer his inclinations to dictate his conclusions.

GEORGE HENRY LEWES.

*(To be concluded in the next Number.)*

## MACAULAY.

It is told of Strafford that before reading any book for the first time, he would call for a sheet of paper, and then proceed to write down upon it some sketch of the ideas that he already had upon the subject of the book, and of the questions that he expected to find answered. No one who has been at the pains to try the experiment, will doubt the usefulness of Strafford's practice: it gives to our acquisitions from books clearness and reality, a right place and an independent shape. At this moment we are all looking for the biography of an illustrious man of letters, written by a near kinsman, who is himself naturally endowed with keen literary interests, and who has invigorated his academic cultivation by practical engagement in considerable affairs of public business. Before taking up Mr. Trevelyan's two volumes, it is perhaps worth while, on Strafford's plan, to ask ourselves shortly what kind of significance or value belongs to Lord Macaulay's achievements, and to what place he has a claim among the forces of English literature. It is seventeen years since he died, and those of us who never knew him nor ever saw him may now think about his work with that perfect detachment which is impossible in the case of actual contemporaries.

That Macaulay comes in the very front rank in the mind of the ordinary bookbuyer of our day is quite certain. It is an amusement with some people to put an imaginary case of banishment to a desert island, with the privilege of choosing the works of one author, and no more, to furnish literary companionship and refreshment for the rest of a lifetime. Whom would one select for this momentous post? Clearly the author must be voluminous, for days on desert islands are many and long; he must be varied in his moods, his topics, and his interests; he must have a great deal to say, and must have a power of saying it that shall arrest a depressed and dolorous spirit. Englishmen, of course, would with mechanical unanimity call for Shakespeare; Germans could hardly hesitate about Goethe; and a sensible Frenchman would pack up the ninety volumes of Voltaire. It would be at least as interesting to know the object of a second choice, supposing the tyrant were in his clemency to give us two authors. In the case of Englishmen there is some evidence as to a popular preference. A recent traveller in Australia informs us that the three books which he found on every squatter's shelf, and which at last he knew before he crossed the threshold that he should be sure to find, were Shakespeare, the

Bible, and Macaulay's Essays. This is only an illustration of a feeling about Macaulay that has been almost universal among the English-speaking peoples.

We may safely say that no man obtains and keeps for a great many years such a position as this, unless he is possessed of some very extraordinary qualities, or else of common qualities in a very uncommon and extraordinary degree. The world, says Goethe, is more willing to endure the Incongruous than to be patient under the Insignificant. Even those who set least value on what Macaulay does for his readers, may still feel bound to distinguish the elements that have given him his vast popularity. The inquiry is not a piece of merely literary criticism, for it is impossible that the work of so imposing a writer should have passed through the hands of every man and woman of his time who has even the humblest pretensions to cultivation, without leaving a very decided mark on their habits both of thought and expression. As a plain matter of observation, it is impossible to take up a newspaper or a review, for instance, without perceiving Macaulay's influence both in the style and the temper of modern journalism, and journalism in its turn acts upon the style and temper of its enormous uncounted public. The man who now succeeds in catching the ear of the writers of leading articles, is in the position that used to be held by the head of some great theological school, whence disciples swarmed forth to reproduce in ten thousand pulpits the arguments, the opinions, the images, the tricks, the gestures, and the mannerisms of a single master.

Two men of very different kinds have thoroughly impressed the journalists of our time, Macaulay and Mr. Mill. Mr. Carlyle we do not add to them; he is, as the Germans call Jean Paul, *der Einzige*. And he is a poet, while the other two are in their degrees serious and argumentative writers, dealing in different ways with the great topics that constitute the matter and business of daily discussion. They are both of them practical enough to interest men handling real affairs, and yet they are general or theoretical enough to supply such men with the large and ready commonplaces which are so useful to a profession that has to produce literary graces and philosophical decorations at an hour's notice. It might perhaps be said of these two distinguished men that our public writers owe most of their virtues to the one, and most of their vices to the other. If Mill taught some of them to reason, Macaulay tempted more of them to declaim: if Mill set an example of patience, tolerance, and fair examination of hostile opinions, Macaulay did much to encourage oracular arrogance, and a rather too thrasonical complacency; if Mill sowed ideas of the great economic, political, and moral bearings of the forces of society, Macaulay trained a taste for super-



ficial particularities, trivial circumstantialities of local colour, and all the paraphernalia of the pseudo-picturesque.

Of course nothing so obviously untrue is meant as that this is an account of Macaulay's own quality. What is empty pretension in the leading article was often a warranted self-assertion in Macaulay; what is little more than testiness in it, is in him often a generous indignation. What became and still remain in those who have made him their model, substantive and organic vices, the foundation of literary character and intellectual temper, were in him the incidental defects of a vigorous genius. And we have to take a man of his power and vigour with all his drawbacks, for the one are wrapped up in the other. Charles Fox used to apply to Burke a passage that Quintilian wrote about Ovid. "*Si animi sui affectibus temperare quam indulgere maluisset,*" quoted Fox, "*quid vir iste præstare non potuerit!*" But this is really not at all certain either of Ovid, or Burke, or anyone else. It suits moralists to tell us that excellence lies in the happy mean and nice balance of our faculties and impulses, and perhaps in so far as our own contentment and an easy passage through life are involved, what they tell us is true. But for making a mark in the world, for rising to supremacy in art or thought or affairs—whatever those aims may be worth—a man possibly does better to indulge rather than to chide or grudge his genius, and to pay the penalties for his weaknesses rather than run any risk of mutilating those strong faculties of which they happen to be an inseparable accident. Versatility is not a universal gift among the able men of the world; not many of them have so many gifts of the spirit as to be free to choose by what pass they will climb 'the steep where Fame's proud temple shines afar.' If Macaulay had applied himself to the cultivation of a balanced judgment, of tempered phrases, and of relative propositions, he would probably have sunk into an impotent tameness. A great pugilist has sometimes been converted from the error of his ways, and been led zealously to cherish gospel graces, but the hero's discourses have seldom been edifying. Macaulay, divested of all the exorbitancies of his spirit and his style, would have been a Samson shorn of the locks of his strength.

Although, however, a writer of marked quality may do well to let his genius develope its spontaneous forces without too assiduous or vigilant repression, trusting to other writers of equal strength in other directions, and to the general fitness of things and operation of time, to redress the balance, still it is the task of criticism in counting up the contributions of one of these strong men to examine the mischiefs no less than the benefits incident to their work. There is no puny carping nor cavilling in the process. It is because such men are strong that they are able to do harm, and they may injure the taste and judgment of a whole generation, just because they are never mediocre. That is implied in

strength. Macaulay is not to be measured now merely as if he were the author of a new book. His influence has been a distinct literary force, and in an age of reading, this is to be a distinct force in deciding the temper, the process, the breadth, of men's opinions, no less than the manner of expressing them. It is no new observation that the influence of an author becomes in time something apart from his books, and that a certain generalised or abstract personality impresses itself on our minds, long after we have forgotten the details of his opinions, the arguments by which he enforced them, and even, what are usually the last to escape us, the images by which he illustrated them. Phrases and sentences are a mask: but we detect the features of the man behind the mask. This personality of a favourite author is a real and powerful agency. Unconsciously we are infected with his humours; we apply his methods; we find ourselves copying the rhythm and measure of his periods; we wonder how he would have acted, or thought, or spoken in our circumstances. Usually a strong writer leaves a special mark in some particular region of mental activity: the final product of him is to fix some persistent religious mood, or some decisive intellectual bias, or else some trick of the tongue. Now Macaulay has contributed no philosophic ideas to the speculative stock, nor has he developed any one great historic or social truth. His work is always full of a high spirit of manliness, probity, and honour; but he is not of that small band to whom we may apply Mackintosh's thrice and four times enviable panegyric on the eloquence of Dugald Stewart, that its peculiar glory consisted in having 'breathed the love of virtue into whole generations' of pupils.' He has painted many striking pictures, and imparted a certain reality to our conception of many great scenes of the past. He did good service in banishing once for all those sentimental Jacobite leanings and prejudices which had been kept alive by the sophistry of the most popular of historians, and the imagination of the most popular of romance-writers. But where he set his stamp has been upon style; style in its widest sense, not merely on the grammar and mechanism of writing, but on what De Quincey described as its *organology*; style, that is to say, in its relation to ideas and feelings, its commerce with thought, and its reaction on what one may call the temper or conscience of the intellect.

Let no man suppose that it matters little whether the most universally popular of the serious authors of a generation—and Macaulay was nothing less than this—affects *style coupé* or *style soutenu*. The critic of style is not the dancing-master, declaiming on the deep ineffable things that lie in a minuet. He is not the virtuoso of supines and gerundives. The morality of style goes deeper 'than dull fools suppose.' When Comte took pains to prevent any sentence exceeding two lines of his manuscript or five

of print; to restrict every paragraph to seven sentences; to exclude every hiatus between two sentences or even between two paragraphs; and never to reproduce any word, except the auxiliary monosyllables, in two consecutive sentences; he justified his literary solicitude by insisting on the wholesomeness alike to heart and intelligence of submission to artificial institutions. He felt, after he had once mastered the habit of the new yoke, that it became the source of continual and unforeseeable improvements even in thought, and he perceived that the reason why verse is a higher kind of literary perfection than prose, is that verse imposes a greater number of rigorous forms. We may add that verse itself is perfected, in the hands of men of poetic genius, in proportion to the severity of this mechanical regulation. Where Pope or Racine had one rule of metre, Victor Hugo has twenty, and he observes them as rigorously as an algebraist or an astronomer observes the rules of calculation or demonstration. One, then, who touches the style of a generation acquires no trifling authority over its thought and temper, as well as over the length of its sentences.

The first and most obvious secret of Macaulay's place on popular bookshelves is that he has a true genius for narration, and narration will always in the eyes not only of our squatters in the Australian bush, but of the many all over the world, stand first among literary gifts. The common run of plain men, as has been noticed since the beginning of the world, are as eager as children for a story, and like children they will embrace the man who will tell them a story, with abundance of details and plenty of colour, and a realistic assurance that it is no mere make-believe. Macaulay never stops to brood over an incident or a character, with an inner eye intent on penetrating to the lowest depth of motive and cause, to the furthest complexity of impulse, calculation, and subtle incentive. The spirit of analysis is not in him, and the divine spirit of meditation is not in him. His whole mind runs in action and movement; it busies itself with eager interest in all objective particulars. He is seized by the external and the superficial, and revels in every detail that appeals to the five senses. "The brilliant Macaulay," said Emerson, with slight exaggeration, "who expresses the tone of the English governing classes of the day, explicitly teaches that *good* means good to eat, good to wear, material commodity." So ready a faculty of exultation in the exceeding great glories of taste and touch, of loud sound and glittering spectacle, is a gift of the utmost service to the narrator who craves immense audiences. Let it be said that if Macaulay exults in the details that go to our five senses, his sensuousness is always clean, manly, and fit for honest daylight and the summer sun. There is none of that curious odour of autumnal

decay that clings to the passion of a more modern school for colour and flavour and the enumerated treasures of subtle indulgence.

Mere picturesqueness, however, is a minor qualification compared with another quality which everybody assumes himself to have, but which is in reality extremely uncommon; the quality, I mean, of telling a tale directly and in straightforward order. In speaking of Hallam, Macaulay complained that Gibbon had brought into fashion an unpleasant trick of telling a story by implication and allusion. This provoking obliquity has certainly increased rather than declined since Hallam's day, and it has reached its height and climax in the latest addition of all to our works of popular history, Mr. Green's clever book upon the English People. Mr. Froude, it is true, whatever may be his shortcomings on the side of sound moral and political judgment, has admirable gifts in the way of straightforward narration, and Mr. Freeman, when he does not press too hotly after emphasis and abstains from overloading his account with superabundance of detail, is usually excellent in the way of direct description. Still, it is not merely because these two writers are alive and Macaulay is not, that most people would say of him that he is unequalled in our time in his mastery of the art of letting us know in an express and unmistakable way exactly what it was that happened, though it is quite true that in many portions of his too elaborated History of William the Third he describes a large number of events about which, I think, no sensible man can in the least care either how they happened, or whether indeed they happened at all or not.

Another reason why people have sought Macaulay is that he has in one way or another something to tell them about many of the most striking personages and interesting events in the history of mankind. And he does really tell them something. If any one will be at the trouble to count up the number of those names that belong to the world and time, about which Macaulay has found not merely something, but something definite and pointed to say, he will be astonished to see how large a portion of the wide historic realm is traversed in that ample flight of reference, allusion, and illustration, and what unsparing copiousness of knowledge gives substance, meaning, and attraction to that blaze and glare of rhetoric.

Macaulay came upon the world of letters, just as the middle classes were expanding into enormous prosperity, were vastly increasing in numbers, and were becoming more alive than they had ever been before to literary interests. His Essays are as good as a library; they make an incomparable manual and vade-mecum for a busy uneducated man who has curiosity and enlightenment enough to wish to know a little about the great lives and great thoughts, the shining words and many-coloured complexities of action, that have marked the journey of man through the ages. Macaulay had an

intimate acquaintance both with the imaginative literature and the history of Greece and Rome, with the literature and the history of modern Italy, of France, and of England. Whatever his special subject, he contrives to pour into it with singular dexterity a stream of rich, graphic, and telling illustrations from all these widely diversified sources. Figures from history, ancient and modern, sacred and secular; characters from plays and novels from Plautus down to Walter Scott and Jane Austen; images and similes from poets of every age and every nation, 'pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical;' shrewd thrusts from satirists, wise saws from sages, pleasantries caustic or pathetic from humorists; all throng Macaulay's pages with the bustle and variety and animation of some glittering masque and cosmoramic revel of great books and heroic men. Hence, though Macaulay was in mental constitution one of the very least Shakesperean writers that ever lived, yet he has the Shakesperean quality of taking his reader through an immense gallery of interesting characters and striking situations. No writer can now expect to attain the widest popularity as a man of letters unless he gives to the world *multa* as well as *multum*. Sainte-Beuve, the most eminent man of letters in France in our generation, wrote no less than twenty-seven volumes of his incomparable *Causeries*. Mr. Carlyle, the most eminent man of letters in England in our generation, has taught us that silence is golden in thirty volumes. Macaulay was not so exuberantly copious as these two illustrious writers, but he had the art of being as various without being so voluminous.

There has been a great deal of deliberate and systematic imitation of Macaulay's style, often by clever men who might well have trusted to their own resources. Its most conspicuous vices are very easy to imitate, but it is impossible for any one who is less familiar with literature than Macaulay was, to reproduce his style effectively, for the reason that it is before all else the style of great literary knowledge. Nor is that all. Macaulay's knowledge was not only very wide; it was both thoroughly accurate and instantly ready. For this stream of apt illustrations he was indebted to his extraordinary memory, and his rapid eye for contrasts and analogies. They come to the end of his pen as he writes; they are not laboriously hunted out in indexes, and then added by way of afterthought and extraneous interpolation. Hence quotations and references that in a writer even of equal knowledge, but with his wits less promptly about him, would seem mechanical and awkward, find their place in a page of Macaulay as if by a delightful process of complete assimilation and spontaneous fusion.

We may be sure that no author could have achieved Macaulay's boundless popularity among his contemporaries, unless his work had

abounded in what is substantially Commonplace. Addison puts fine-writing in sentiments that are natural without being obvious, and this is a true account of the 'law' of the exquisite literature of the Queen Anne men. We may perhaps add to Addison's definition, that the great secret of the best kind of popularity is always the noble or imaginative handling of Commonplace. Shakespeare may at first seem an example to the contrary; and indeed is it not a standing marvel that the greatest writer of a nation that is distinguished among all nations for the pharisaism, puritanism, and unimaginative narrowness of its judgments on conduct and type of character, should be paramount over all writers for the breadth, maturity, fulness, subtlety, and infinite variousness of his conception of human life and nature? One possible answer to the perplexity is that the puritanism does not go below the surface in us, and that Englishmen are not really limited in their view by the too strait formulas that are supposed to contain their explanations of the moral universe. On this theory the popular appreciation of Shakespeare is the irrepressible response of the hearty inner man to a voice in which he recognises the full note of human nature, and those wonders of the world which are not dreamt of in his professed philosophy. A more obvious answer than this is that Shakespeare's popularity with the many is not due to those finer glimpses that are the very essence of all poetic delight to the few, but to his thousand other magnificent attractions, and above all, after his skill as a pure dramatist and master of scenic interest and situation, to the lofty or pathetic setting with which he vivifies, not the subtleties or refinements, but the commonest and most elementary traits of the commonest and most elementary human moods. The few with minds touched by nature or right cultivation to the finer issues, admire the supreme genius which takes some poor Italian tale, with its coarse plot and gross personages, and shooting it through with threads of variegated meditation, produces a masterpiece of penetrative reflection and high pensive suggestion as to the deepest things and most secret parts of the life of men. But to the general these finer threads are undiscernible. What touches them, and most rightly touches them and us all, in the Shakespearian poetry, are topics eternally old, yet of eternal freshness, the perennial truisms of the grave and the bride-chamber, of shifting fortune, the surprises of destiny, the emptiness of the answered vow. This is the region in which the poet wins his widest if not his hardest triumphs, the region of the noble Commonplace.

A writer dealing with such matters as principally occupied Macaulay has not the privilege of resort to these great poetic inspirations. Yet history, too, has its generous commonplaces, its plausibilities of emotion, and no one has ever delighted more than Macaulay did to appeal to the fine truisms that cluster round love of freedom and love of native land. The high rhetorical topics of liberty and patriotism are his

readiest instruments for kindling a glowing reflection of these magnanimous passions in the breasts of his readers. That Englishman is hardly to be envied who can read without a glow such passages as that in the History about Turenne being startled by the shout of stern exultation with which his English allies advanced to the combat, and expressing the delight of a true soldier when he learned that it was ever the fashion of Cromwell's pikemen to rejoice greatly when they beheld the enemy; while even the banished cavaliers felt an emotion of national pride when they saw a brigade of their countrymen, outnumbered by foes and abandoned by friends, drive before it in headlong rout the finest infantry of Spain, and force a passage into a counterscarp which had just been pronounced impregnable by the ablest of the marshals of France. Such prose as this is not less thrilling to a man who loves his country, than the spirited verse of the Lays of Ancient Rome. And the commonplaces of patriotism and freedom would never have been so powerful in Macaulay's hands if they had not been inspired by a sincere and hearty faith in them in the soul of the writer. His unanalytical turn of mind kept him free of any temptation to think of love of country as a prejudice, or a passion for freedom as an illusion. The cosmopolitan or international idea which such teachers as Cobden have tried to impress on our stubborn islanders, would have found in Macaulay not lukewarm or sceptical adherence, but pointblank opposition and denial. He believed as stoutly in the supremacy of Great Britain in the history of the good causes of Europe, as M. Thiers believes in the supremacy of France, or Mazzini believed in that of Italy. The thought of the prodigious industry, the inventiveness, the stout enterprise, the free government, the wise and equal laws, the noble literature, of this fortunate island and its majestic empire beyond the seas, and the discretion, valour, and tenacity by which all these great material and still greater intangible possessions had been first won and then kept against every hostile comer whether domestic or foreign, sent through Macaulay a thrill, like that which the thought of Paris and its heroisms moves in the great poet of France, or sight of the dear city of the Violet Crown moved in an Athenian of old. Thus habitually, with all sincerity of heart, to offer to one of the greater popular prepossessions the incense due to any other idol of superstition, sacred and of indisputable authority, and to let this adoration be seen shining in every page, is one of the keys that every man must find who would make a quick and sure way into the temple of contemporary fame.

It is one of the first things to be said about Macaulay, that he was in exact accord with the common average sentiment of his day on every subject on which he spoke. His superiority was not of that highest kind which leads a man to march in thought on the outside margin of

the crowd, watching them, sympathising with them, hoping for them, but apart. Macaulay was one of the middle-class crowd in his heart, and only rose above it by extraordinary gifts of expression. He had none of that ambition which inflames some hardy men, to make new beliefs and new passions enter the minds of their neighbours; his ascendancy is due to literary pomp, not to fecundity of spirit. No one has ever surpassed him in the art of combining resolute and ostentatious common sense of a slightly coarse sort in choosing his point of view, with so considerable an appearance of dignity and elevation in setting it forth and impressing it upon others. The elaborateness of his style is very likely to mislead people into imagining for him a corresponding elaborateness of thought and sentiment. On the contrary, Macaulay's mind was really very simple, strait, and with as few notes in its register, to borrow a phrase from the language of vocal compass, as there are few notes, though they are very loud, in the register of his written prose. When we look more closely into it, what at first wore the air of dignity and elevation, in truth rather disagreeably resembles the narrow assurance of a man who knows that he has with him the great battalions of public opinion. We are always quite sure that if Macaulay had been an Athenian citizen towards the ninety-fifth Olympiad, he would have taken sides with Anytus and Meletus in the impeachment of Socrates. A popular author must take the accepted maxims for granted in a thoroughgoing way. He must suppress any whimsical fancy for applying the Socratic elenchus, or any other engine of criticism, scepticism, or verification, to those sentiments or current precepts of morals, which may in fact be very two-sided and may be much neglected in practice, but which the public opinion of his time requires to be treated in theory and in literature as if they had been cherished and held sacred *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*.

This is just what Macaulay does, and it is commonly supposed to be no heavy fault in him or any other writer for the common public. Man cannot live by analysis alone, nor nourish himself on the secret delights of irony. And if Macaulay had only reflected the more generous of the prejudices of mankind, it would have been well enough. Burke, for instance, was a writer who revered the prejudices of a modern society as deeply as Macaulay did; he believed society to be founded on prejudices and held compact by them. Yet what size there is in Burke, what fine perspective, what momentum, what edification! It may be pleaded that there is the literature of edification, and there is the literature of knowledge, and that the qualities proper to the one cannot lawfully be expected from the other, and would only be very much out of place if they should happen to be found there. But there are two answers to this. First, Macaulay in the course of his varied writings discusses all



sorts of ethical and other matters, and is not simply a chronicler of party and intrigue, of dynasties and campaigns. Second, and more than this, even if he had never travelled beyond the composition of historical record, he could still have sown his pages, as does every truly great writer, no matter what his subject may be, with those significant images or far-reaching suggestions, which suddenly light up a whole range of distant thoughts and sympathies within us; which in an instant affect the sensibilities of men with a something new and unforeseen; and which awaken, if only for a passing moment, the faculty and response of the diviner mind. Tacitus does all this, and Burke does it, and that is why men who care nothing for Roman despots or for Jacobin despots, will still perpetually turn to those writers almost as if they were on the level of great poets or very excellent spiritual teachers.

One secret is that they, and all such men as they were, had that of which Macaulay can hardly have had the rudimentary germ, the faculty of deep abstract meditation and surrender to the fruitful 'leisures of the spirit.' We can picture Macaulay talking, or making a speech in the House of Commons, or buried in a book, or scouring his library for references, or covering his blue foolscap with dashing periods, or accentuating his sentences and barbing his phrases; but can anybody think of him as meditating, as modestly pondering and wondering, as possessed for so much as ten minutes by that spirit of inwardness which has never been wholly wanting in any of those kings and princes of literature, with whom it is good for men to sit in counsel? He seeks Truth, not as she should be sought, devoutly, tentatively, and with the air of one touching the hem of a sacred garment, but clutching her by the hair of the head and dragging her after him in a kind of boisterous triumph, a prisoner of war and not a goddess.

All this finds itself reflected, as the inner temper of a man always is reflected, in his style of written prose. The merits of his prose are obvious enough. It naturally reproduces the good qualities of his understanding, its strength, manliness, and directness. That exultation in material goods and glories of which we have already spoken makes his pages rich in colour, and gives them the effect of a sumptuous gala-suit. Certainly the brocade is too brand-new, and has none of the delicate charm that comes to such finery when it is a little faded. Again, nobody can have any excuse for not knowing exactly what it is that Macaulay means. We may assuredly say of his prose what Boileau says of his own poetry—'*Et mon vers, bien ou mal, dit toujours quelque chose.*' This is a prodigious merit, when we reflect with what fatal alacrity human language lends itself in the hands of so many performers upon the pliant instrument, to all sorts of obscurity, ambiguity, disguise and pretentious mystifi-

cation. Scaliger is supposed to have remarked of the Basques and their desperate tongue: 'Tis said the Basques understand one another; for my part, I will never believe it.' The same pungent doubt might apply to loftier members of the hierarchy of speech than that forlorn dialect, but never to English as handled by Macaulay. He never wrote an obscure sentence in his life, and this may seem a small merit, until we remember of how few writers we could say the same.

Macaulay is of those who think prose as susceptible of polished and definite form as verse, and he was, we should suppose, of those also who hold the type and mould of all written language to be spoken language. There are more reasons for demurring to the soundness of the latter doctrine than can conveniently be made to fill a digression here. For one thing, spoken language necessarily implies one or more listeners, whereas written language may often have to express meditative moods and trains of inward reflection that move through the mind without trace of external reference, and that would lose their special traits by the introduction of any suspicion that they were to be overheard. Again, even granting that all composition must be supposed to be meant by the fact of its existence to be addressed to a body of readers, it still remains to be shown that indirect address to the inner ear should follow the same method and rhythm as address directly through impressions on the outer organ. The attitude of the recipient mind is different, and there is the symbolism of a new medium between it and the speaker. The writer, being cut off from all those effects which are producible by the physical intonations of the voice, has to find substitutes for them by other means, by subtler cadences, by a more varied modulation, by firmer notes, by more complex circuits, than suffice for the utmost perfection of spoken language, which has all the potent and manifold aids of personality. In writing, whether it be prose or verse, you are free to produce effects whose peculiarity one can only define vaguely by saying that the senses have one part less in them than in any other of the forms and effects of art, and the imaginary voice one part more. But the question need not be laboured here, because there can be no dispute as to the quality of Macaulay's prose. Its measures are emphatically the measures of spoken deliverance. Those who have made the experiment, pronounce him to be one of the authors whose works are most admirably fitted for reading aloud. His firmness and directness of statement, his spiritedness, his art of selecting salient and highly coloured detail, and all his other merits as a narrator keep the listener's attention, and make him the easiest of writers to follow.

Although, however, clearness, directness, and positiveness are master qualities and the indispensable foundations of all good style,

yet does the matter plainly by no means end with them. And it is even possible to have these virtues so unhappily proportioned and inauspiciously mixed with other turns and casts of mind, as to end in work with little grace or harmony or fine tracery about it, but only overweening purpose and vehement will. And it is overweeningness and self-confident will that are the chief notes of Macaulay's style. It has no benignity. Energy is doubtless a delightful quality, but then Macaulay's energy is energy without momentum, and he impresses us more by a strong volubility than by volume. It is the energy of interests and intuitions, which though they are profoundly sincere if ever they were sincere in any man, are yet in the relations which they comprehend, essentially superficial.

Still, trenchancy whether in speaker or writer is a most effective tone for a large public. It gives them confidence in their man, and prevents tediousness—except to those who reflect how delicate is the poise of truth, what steepes and pits encompass the dealer in unqualified propositions. To such persons, a writer who is trenchant in every sentence of every page, who never lapses for a line into the contingent, who marches through the intricacies of things in a blaze of certainty, is not only a writer to be distrusted, but the owner of a doubtful and displeasing style. It is a great test of style to watch how an author disposes of the qualifications, limitations, and exceptions that clog the wings of his main proposition. The grave and conscientious men of the seventeenth century insisted on packing them all honestly along with the main proposition itself within the bounds of a single period. Burke arranges them in tolerably close order in the paragraph. Dr. Newman, that winning writer, disperses them lightly over his page. Of Macaulay it is hardly unfair to say that he dispatches all qualifications into outer space before he begins to write, or if he magnanimously admits one or two here and there, it is only to bring them the more imposingly to the same murderous end.

We have spoken of Macaulay's interests and intuitions wearing a certain air of superficiality; there is a feeling of the same kind about his attempts to be genial. It is not truly festive. There is no abandonment in it. It has no deep root in moral humour, and is merely a literary form, resembling nothing so much as the hard geniality of some clever college tutor of stiff manners entertaining undergraduates at an official breakfast-party. This is not because his tone is bookish; on the contrary, his tone and level are distinctly those of the man of the world. But one always seems to find that neither a wide range of cultivation nor familiar access to the best Whig circles had quite removed the stiffness and self-conscious precision of the Clapham Sect. We would give much for a little more flexibility, and would welcome even a slight consciousness of infirmity. As has been said, the only people whom men

cannot pardon are the perfect. Macaulay is like the military king who never suffered himself to be seen, even by the attendants in his bedchamber, until he had had time to put on his uniform and jack-boots. His severity of eye is very wholesome; it makes his writing firm, and firmness is certainly one of the first qualities that good writing must have. But there is such a thing as soft and considerate precision, as well as hard and scolding precision. Those most interesting English critics of the generation slightly anterior to Macaulay,—Hazlitt, Lamb, De Quincey, Leigh Hunt,—were fully his equals in precision, and yet they knew how to be clear, acute, and definite, without that edginess and inelasticity which is so conspicuous in Macaulay's criticisms, alike in their matter and their form.

To borrow the figure of an old writer, Macaulay's prose is not like a flowing vestment to his thought, but like a suit of armour. It is often splendid and glittering, and the movement of the opening pages of his History is superb in its dignity. But that movement is exceptional. As a rule there is the hardness, if there is also often the sheen, of highly-wrought metal. Or, to change our figure, his pages are composed as a handsome edifice is reared, not as a fine statue or a frieze 'with bossy sculptures graven' grows up in the imaginative mind of the statuary. There is no liquid continuity, such as indicates a writer possessed by his subject and not merely possessing it. The periods are marshalled in due order of procession, bright and high-stepping; they never escape under an impulse of emotion into the full current of a brimming stream. What is curious is that though Macaulay seems ever to be brandishing a two-edged gleaming sword, and though he steeps us in an atmosphere of belligerency, yet we are never conscious of inward agitation in him, and perhaps this alone would debar him from a place among the greatest writers. For they, under that reserve, suppression, or management, which is an indispensable condition of the finest rhetorical art, even when aiming at the most passionate effects, still succeed in conveying to their readers a thrilling sense of the strong fires that are glowing underneath. Now when Macaulay advances with his hectoring sentences and his rough pistolling ways, we feel all the time that his pulse is as steady as that of the most practised duellist who ever ate fire. He is too cool to be betrayed into a single phrase of happy improvisation. His pictures glare, but are seldom warm. Those strokes of minute circumstantiality which he loved so dearly, show that even in moments when his imagination might seem to be moving both spontaneously and ardently, it was really only a literary instrument, a fashioning tool and not a melting flame. Let us take a single example. He is describing the trial of Warren Hastings. "Every step in the proceedings," he says,

"carried the mind either backward through many troubled centuries to the days when the foundations of our constitution were laid; or far away over boundless seas and deserts, to dusky nations living under strange stars, worshipping strange gods, and writing strange characters from right to left." The odd triviality of the last detail, its unworthiness of the sentiment of the passage, leaves the reader checked; what sets out as a fine stroke of imagination dwindles down to a sort of literary conceit. And so in other places, even where the writer is most deservedly admired for gorgeous picturesque effect, we feel that it is only the literary picturesque, a kind of infinitely glorified newspaper-reporting. Compare, for instance, the most imaginative piece to be found in any part of Macaulay's writings with that sudden and lovely apostrophe in Carlyle, after describing the bloody horrors that followed the fall of the Bastille in 1789:—"O evening sun of July, how, at this hour, thy beams fall slant on reapers amid peaceful woody fields; on old women spinning in cottages; on ships far out in the silent main; on balls at the Orangerie of Versailles, where high-rouged dames of the Palace are even now dancing with double-jacketed Hussar-officers;—and also on this roaring Hell-porch of a Hôtel de Ville!" Who does not feel in this the breath of poetic inspiration, and how different it is from the mere composite of the rhetorician's imagination, assiduously working to order?

This remark is no disparagement of Macaulay's genius, but a classification of it. We are interrogating our own impressions, and asking ourselves among what kind of writers he ought to be placed. Rhetoric is a good and worthy art, and rhetorical authors are often more useful, more instructive, more really respectable than poetical authors. But it is to be said that Macaulay as a rhetorician will hardly be placed in the first rank by those who have studied both him and the great masters. Once more, no amount of embellishment or emphasis or brilliant figure suffices to produce this intense effect of agitation rigorously restrained; nor can any beauty of decoration be in the least a substitute for that touching and penetrative music which is made in prose by the repressed trouble of grave and high souls. There is a certain music, we do not deny, in Macaulay, but it is the music of a man everlastingly playing for us rapid solos on a silver trumpet, never the swelling diapasons of the organ, and never the deep ecstasies of the four magic strings. That so sensible a man as Macaulay should keep clear of the modern abomination of dithyrambic prose, that rank and sprawling weed of speech, was natural enough; but then the effects which we miss in him, and which, considering how strong the literary faculty in him really was, we are almost astonished to miss, are not produced by dithyramb but by repression. Of course the answer has been

already given ; Macaulay, powerful and vigorous as he was, had no agitation, no wonder, no tumult of spirit, to repress. The world was spread out clear before him ; he read it as plainly and as certainly as he read his books ; life was all an affair of direct categoricals.

This was at least one secret of those hard modulations and shallow cadences. How poor is the rhythm of Macaulay's prose, we only realise by going with his periods fresh in our ear to some true master of harmony. It is not worth while to quote passages from an author who is in everybody's library, and Macaulay is always so much like himself that almost any one page will serve for an illustration exactly as well as any other. Let anyone turn to his character of Somers, for whom he had much admiration, and then turn to Clarendon's character of Falkland ;—"a person of such prodigious parts of learning and knowledge, of that inimitable sweetness and delight in conversation, of so flowing and obliging a humanity and goodness to mankind, and of that primitive simplicity and integrity of life, that if there were no other brand upon this odious and accursed civil war than that single loss, it must be most infamous and execrable to all posterity." Now Clarendon is not a great writer, nor even a good writer, for he is prolix and involved, yet we see that even Clarendon, when he comes to a matter in which his heart is engaged, becomes sweet and harmonious in his rhythm. If we turn to a prose-writer of the very first place, we are instantly conscious of a still greater difference. How flashy and shallow Macaulay's periods seem as we listen to the fine ground-base that rolls in the melody of the following passage of Burke's, and it is taken from one of the least ornate of all his pieces :—

"You will not, we trust, believe, that, born in a civilized country, formed to gentle manners, trained in a merciful religion, and living in enlightened and polished times, where even foreign hostility is softened from its original sternness, we could have thought of letting loose upon you, our late beloved brethren, these fierce tribes of savages and cannibals, in whom the traces of human nature are effaced by ignorance and barbarity. We rather wished to have joined with you in bringing gradually that unhappy part of mankind into civility, order, piety, and virtuous discipline, than to have confirmed their evil habits and increased their natural ferocity by fleshing them in the slaughter of you, whom our wiser and better ancestors had sent into the wilderness with the express view of introducing, along with our holy religion, its humane and charitable manners. We do not hold that all things are lawful in war. We should think every barbarity, in fire, in wasting, in murders, in tortures, and other cruelties, too horrible and too full of turpitude for Christian mouths to utter or ears to hear, if done at our instigation, by those who we know will make war thus if they make it at all, to be, to all intents and purposes, as if done by ourselves. We clear ourselves to you our brethren, to the present age, and to future generations, to our king and our country, and to Europe,

which, as a spectator, beholds this tragic scene, of every part or share in adding this last and worst of evils to the inevitable mischiefs of a civil war.

"We do not call you rebels and traitors. We do not call for the vengeance of the crown against you. We do not know how to qualify millions of our countrymen, contending with one heart for an admission to privileges which we have ever thought our own happiness and honor, by odious and unworthy names. On the contrary, we highly revere the principles on which you act, though we lament some of their effects. Armed as you are, we embrace you, as our friends and as our brethren by the best and dearest ties of relation."

It may be said that there is a patent injustice in comparing the prose of a historian criticising or describing great events at second hand, with the prose of a statesman taking active part in great events, fired by the passion of a present conflict, and stimulated by the vivid interest of undetermined issues. If this be a well grounded plea, and it may be so, then of course it excludes a contrast not only with Burke, but also with Bolingbroke, whose fine manners and polished gaiety give us a keen sense of the grievous garishness of Macaulay. If we may not imitate a comparison between Macaulay and great actors on the stage of affairs, at least there can be no objection to the introduction of Southey as a standard of comparison. Southey was a man of letters pure and simple, and it is worth remarking that Macaulay himself admitted that he found so great a charm in Southey's style, as nearly always to read it with pleasure, even when Southey was talking nonsense. Now, take any page of the *Life of Nelson* or the *Life of Wesley*; consider how easy, smooth, natural, and winning is the diction and the rise and fall of the sentence, and yet how varied the rhythm and how nervous the phrases; and then turn to a page of Macaulay, and wince under its stamping emphasis, its overcoloured tropes, its exaggerated expressions, its unlovely staccato. Southey's history of the Peninsular War is now dead, but if any of my readers has a copy on his highest shelves, I would venture to ask him to take down the third volume, and read the concluding pages, of which Coleridge used to say that they were the finest specimen of historic eulogy he had ever read in English, adding with forgivable hyperbole, that they were more to the Duke's fame and glory than a campaign. "Foresight and enterprise with our commander went hand in hand; he never advanced but so as to be sure of his retreat; and never retreated but in such an attitude as to impose upon a superior enemy," and so on through the sum of Wellington's achievements. "There was something more precious than these, more to be desired than the high and enduring fame which he had secured by his military achievements, the satisfaction of thinking to what end those achievements had been directed; that they were for the deliverance of two most injured and grievously oppressed nations; for the safety, honour, and welfare of

his own country ; and for the general interests of Europe and of the civilized world. His campaigns were sanctified by the cause ; they were sullied by no cruelties, no crimes ; the chariot-wheels of his triumphs have been followed by no curses ; his laurels are entwined with the amaranths of righteousness, and upon his death-bed he might remember his victories among his good works."

With this exquisite modulation still delighting the ear, we open Macaulay's Essays and stumble on such sentences as this: "That Tickell should have been guilty of a villany seems to us highly improbable. That Addison should have been guilty of a villany seems to us highly improbable. But that these two men should have conspired together to commit a villany seems to us improbable in a tenfold degree." *"Ὁ μιαρὸν, καὶ παρμιαρὸν, καὶ μιαρῶτατον !* Surely this is the very burlesque and travesty of a style. Yet it is a characteristic passage. It would be easy to find a thousand examples of the same vicious workmanship, and it would be difficult to find a page in which these cut and disjointed sentences are not the type and mode of the prevailing rhythm.

What is worse than want of depth and fineness of intonation in a period is all gross excess of colour, because excess of colour is connected with graver faults in the region of the intellectual conscience. Macaulay is a constant sinner in this respect. The wine of truth is in his cup a brandied draught, a hundred degrees above proof, and he too often replenishes the lamp of knowledge with naphtha instead of fine oil. It is not that he has a spontaneous passion for exuberant decoration, which he would have shared with more than one of the greatest names in literature. On the contrary, we feel that the exaggerated words and dashing sentences are the fruit of deliberate travail, and the petulance or the irony of his speech is mostly due to a driving predilection for strong effects. His memory, his directness, his aptitude for forcing things into firm outline, and giving them a sharply defined edge,—these and other singular talents of his all lent themselves to this intrepid and indefatigable pursuit of effect. And the most disagreeable feature is that Macaulay was so often content with an effect of an essentially vulgar kind, offensive to taste, discordant to the fastidious ear, and worst of all, at enmity with the whole spirit of truth. By vulgar we certainly do not mean homely, which marks a wholly different quality. No writer can be more homely than Mr. Carlyle, alike in his choice of particulars to dwell upon, and in the terms or images in which he describes or illustrates them, but there is also no writer further removed from vulgarity. Nor do we mean that Macaulay too copiously enriches the tongue with infusion from any Doric dialect. For such raciness he had little taste. What we find in him is that quality which the French call brutal. The description, for instance, in the essay on



Hallam, of the license of the Restoration, seems to us a coarse and vulgar picture, whose painter took the most garish colours he could find on his palette and laid them on in untempered crudity. And who is not sensible of the vulgarity and coarseness of the account of Boswell? "If he had not been a great fool, he would not have been a great writer . . . he was a dunce, a parasite, and a coxcomb," and so forth, in which the shallowness of the analysis of Boswell's character matches the puerile rudeness of the terms. Here, again, is a sentence about Montesquieu. "The English at that time," Macaulay says of the middle of the eighteenth century, "considered a Frenchman who talked about constitutional checks and fundamental laws as a prodigy not less astonishing than the learned pig or musical infant." And he then goes on to describe the author of one of the most important books that ever were written as "specious but shallow, studious of effect, indifferent to truth—the lively President," and so forth, stirring in any reader who happens to know Montesquieu's influence, a singular amazement. We are not concerned with the judgment upon Montesquieu, nor with the truth as to contemporary English opinion about him, but a writer who devises an antithesis to such a man as Montesquieu in learned pigs and musical infants, deliberately condescends not merely to triviality or levity but to flat vulgarity of thought, to something of mean and ignoble association. Though one of the most common, this is not Macaulay's only sin in the same unfortunate direction. He too frequently resorts to vulgar gaudiness. For example, there is in one place a certain description of an alleged practice of Addison's. Swift had said of Esther Johnson that "whether from her easiness in general, or from her indifference to persons, or from her despair of mending them, or from the same practice which she most liked in Mr. Addison, I cannot determine; but when she saw any of the company very warm in a wrong opinion, she was more inclined to confirm them in it than to oppose them. It prevented noise, she said, and saved time."<sup>1</sup> Let us behold what a picture Macaulay draws on the strength of this passage. "If his first attempts to set a presuming dunce right were ill-received," Macaulay says of Addison, "he changed his tone, 'assented with civil leer,' and lured the flattered coxcomb deeper and deeper into absurdity." To compare this transformation of the simplicity of the original into the grotesque heat and overcharged violence of the copy, is to see the homely maiden of a country village transformed into the painted flaunter of the city.

One more instance. We should be sorry to violate any sentiment of *τὸ σεμνόν* about a man of Macaulay's genius, but what is a decorous term for a description of the doctrine of Lucretius's great

(1) Forster's "Swift," i. 265.

poem, thrown in parenthetically, as the "silliest and meanest system of natural and moral philosophy"? Even disagreeable artifices of composition may be forgiven when they serve to vivify truth, to quicken or to widen the moral judgment, but Macaulay's hardy and habitual recourse to strenuous superlatives is fundamentally unscientific and untrue. There is no more instructive example in our literature than he, of the saying that the adjective is the enemy of the substantive.

In 1837 Jeffrey saw a letter written by Macaulay to a common friend, and stating the reasons for preferring a literary to a political life. Jeffrey thought that his illustrious ally was wrong in the conclusion to which he came. "As to the tranquillity of an author's life," he said, "I have no sort of faith in it. And as to fame, if an author's is now and then more lasting, it is generally longer withheld, and except in a few rare cases it is of a less pervading or elevating description. A great poet or a great *original* writer is above all other glory. But who would give much for such a glory as Gibbon's? Besides, I believe it is in the inward glow and pride of consciously influencing the destinies of mankind, much more than in the sense of personal reputation, that the delight of either poet or statesman chiefly consists." And Gibbon had at least the advantage of throwing himself into a controversy destined to endure for centuries. He, moreover, was specifically a historian, while Macaulay has been prized less as a historian proper, than as a master of literary art. Now a man of letters, in an age of battle and transition like our own, fades into an ever-deepening distance, unless he has while he writes that touching and impressive quality,—the presentiment of the eve; a feeling of the difficulties and interests that will engage and distract mankind on the morrow. Nor can it be enough for enduring fame in any age merely to throw a golden halo round the secularity of the hour, or to make glorious the narrowest limitations of the passing day. If we think what a changed sense is already given to criticism, what a different conception now presides over history, how many problems on which he was silent are now the familiar puzzles of even superficial readers, we cannot help feeling that the eminent man whose life we are all about to read, is the hero of a past which is already remote, and that he did little to make men better fitted to face a present of which, close as it was to him, he seems hardly to have dreamed.

EDITOR.

## THE FINANCES OF INDIA.<sup>1</sup>

THE finances of India may at this time have a special interest in Manchester (even beyond that which Manchester always takes in our Eastern Empire), because the possibility of effecting fiscal changes desired, and I may almost say demanded, by the manufacturers of this country must depend on the state of the finances. Before large sources of revenue can be abandoned, it must be shown either that the finances are so prosperous that the money can be spared, or that the income necessary for the public service can be raised in some other way.

In saying this I do not express any opinion of my own on the propriety of abolishing the duties on the import of manufactured goods. The Indian duties were certainly not imposed for purposes of protection, and they are very moderate in amount, not now in any case exceeding five per cent. Seeing the large revenue derived from the cotton duties, an independent ruler of India would probably not remit these duties. Still, I quite feel that in our administration of India it may fairly be expected that the fullest justice should be done not only to the people of India, but also to the manufacturers and people of this country. And I approach the subject looking to the fact that the views expressed in

(1) The present paper was prepared for, and, with some abbreviations to save time, read to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce in December last, in accordance with a wish which some of the leading men in the Chamber had been good enough to express. Indian financial affairs seem to have now an interest which may justify the publication of the paper. I should only like to add that I have seen with some surprise that public men in high position have ventured to speak of an entirely fictitious surplus of the last two years—a surplus which is only made out by eliminating altogether the famine charges, as well as the great public works, in a manner entirely arbitrary. The public accounts required by Parliament show, and can show, no such figures. I take, from a very recent official statement, the following account of surplus and deficit for the last six years, which will serve for reference in reading the following pages.

Year.	Surplus, exclusive of Public Works Extraordinary.	Surplus, inclusive of Public Works Extraordinary.	Deficit, exclusive of Public Works Extraordinary.	Deficit, inclusive of Public Works Extraordinary.
	£	£	£	£
1870-1	1,482,990	315,180	—	—
1871-2	3,124,177	1,495,703	—	—
1872-3	1,765,672	—	—	418,897
1873-4	—	—	1,807,668	5,360,975
1874-5	—	—	494,489	4,526,592
(regular estimate) }	—	—	—	—
1875-6	—	—	—	—
(budget estimate) }	506,000	—	—	3,794,000

Manchester have been in a sense accepted by the highest official authority, when Lord Salisbury gave it as his opinion that the duties must go as soon as the thing is possible. It is, then, at least time to consider whether the measure is, or probably soon will be, financially possible, and I confine myself to that question. I most strongly hold that the financial question must govern all others. It would be the gravest injustice to cause a deficit in the Indian finance.

I am myself all for prudence in matters of finance. I do not at all like the modern fashion of incurring great debts and trusting to the future for their repayment. But in India I go further than this. I am not content that in time of peace and prosperity we should make the two ends meet. I think that there is this most cardinal and essential difference between Indian finance and that of our own and other self-governing countries—that while we can appeal to the purses and patriotism of our own people to raise additional revenues in case of war or misfortune, in India the very opposite is the case. There, the harder we are pressed the more difficult, I may say impossible, we should find it to raise additional revenue. I must ask your very particular attention to this point, for I think it is one to which sufficient advertence has not been had. It is in time of peace and quiet that the taxes really necessary can safely be imposed, and the public may be habituated to them. In time of adversity it would be almost as much as our rule is worth to do any such thing. Consequently, in such times of need, if we have stored nothing in prosperity, there is nothing for it but to borrow, and to borrow in this country. I say that, under the circumstances of India, it is only prudent to create a good margin in time of peace, on which we may fall back in time of adversity.

The Indian populations are to an excessive degree creatures of habit. They do not so much object to taxation to which they are accustomed as to novelty in taxation. So long as a tax is new it is disliked in the extreme. But in a few years it ceases to be new, and, if not in itself very bad and vexatious, it is acquiesced in as part of the established and natural order of things.

Another difference between India as now governed and Europe I will allude to before going further. In a self-governed country it is often argued that not only are debts represented by real and good public improvements nothing more than a judicious expenditure of capital, but also they serve as sort of ballast to the state, in consequence of the interest in peace and good government of so many influential fundholders who cannot afford to suffer revolution and anarchy. Be this as it may, the case is widely different when, as of late in India, the borrowed money for the most part comes from the distant country of the governors, not from that of the governed. The amount remitted year by year from India to England is already

enormous. That amount is year by year increasing ; it must be a great source of eventual political weakness ; and to add to the amount by incurring fresh debts in England, even for useful purposes, is I submit very questionable policy. I am aware that the Government has taken this view, and has recently sought to raise loans in India rather than in England—we are even told that the last loan was mainly taken up by natives. But I understand that, under the English system of tenders by capitalists who resell to the public, this only means that native stockjobbers were even keener than Europeans for the chances of the market. We have no assurance that the stock is permanently held by the native public. Certainly the proportion held by natives is far less than in former days.

Yet the natives have great want of a secure investment for money, and had great faith in a Government annuity, though that faith was much shaken by some of our dealings during and after the Mutiny. I am not without regrets for the old system of open loans if money must be borrowed for public works. Formerly, when loans were open at a low rate, and natives could at any time put their money into the local Treasury without the intervention of a stockjobber, much native money flowed in in a quiet way.

With these preliminary remarks I come to the present condition of Indian finance. It has been the fashion with some people to describe it as extremely prosperous. In this I do not agree. I think that while much attention has been paid to economy, still much of the apparent improvement is the result of manipulating figures, and throwing expenses hitherto charged against income into the new head of "extraordinary," to be met by borrowing. Whether the present financial condition be sound or unsound, I do distinctly assert that it is less satisfactory than in some former periods ; that recent alleged surpluses on the "ordinary" account are not real surpluses ; and that, while the times are most prosperous, we are not making any sufficient provision against a rainy day. There is very little surplus on the account called "ordinary," and a large deficit on the extraordinary account.

In dealing with the matter I shall not trouble you with very numerous figures or with any very detailed calculations of my own. I shall take only the simplest and most recent figures presented to Parliament and published, as they appear in the last "Statistical Abstract relating to British India," and in "The Annual Report of the Progress and Condition of India."

First let us look at the debts which we have incurred, and see what we have to show for them. After a hundred years spent in the acquisition of the rule of all India, after many wars and many civil and commercial struggles, the East India Company reached the

year 1857, with a debt of about fifty millions—not a very large sum with so great an empire and all its fittings and appliances to show for it.

The Mutiny involved a very large expenditure and a very large debt, for the most part inevitable. And in another form the guaranteed railways have caused for a time a great increase of payments. I may say, however, that, so far as regards the trunk lines on Lord Dalhousie's plan, I consider the railways to be a distinct success. They already pay on the whole a very considerable interest on the sums expended. Several of the chief lines may now be deemed self-supporting or nearly so, and there is reasonable prospect that the whole annual loss will soon be reduced to figures which cannot be set against the vastly improved facilities which they directly afford for purposes of government, to say nothing of commercial advantages.

Looking to page 11 of the Statistical Abstract, I find that on 30th April, 1865, the total debt and obligations amounted to £98,475,555, while on the 31st March, 1874, the amount was £122,184,024, a difference of nearly twenty-four millions. Again in 1874-5 there has been a deficit, on the whole, of £4,526,592; and in the present year a large deficit is expected, according to the official statement, if all charges be included. There have been apparently some changes in the mode of account with respect to "obligations," some having been cancelled and others added; but I cannot doubt that our liabilities have been increased by at least some twenty-five millions sterling since 1865.

Now what have we to show for this deficit? Happily no great wars; the Empire has enjoyed almost uninterrupted peace and generally uninterrupted prosperity. The famines which have afflicted certain parts of the country are visitations which in one part of India or another may be traced in almost every decade. We must look for a justification, both for the deficit and for the failure of a proper saving for years of adversity, to the great public works which are supposed to justify the "extraordinary" head, under which the deficit is euphoniously veiled.

I fully admit that so far as Government undertakes works commercially remunerative, works which might fairly be the task of private enterprise and which the Government assumes for peculiar political reasons, in such case the expenditure may be rightly kept apart as "extraordinary." But I think the "extraordinary" account should be confined to such cases; and when I was a member of the Council of India I most heartily concurred in a dispatch to the Government of India in which the Secretary of State strictly laid down the rule that the "extraordinary" expenditure was to be

absolutely confined to works *directly* remunerative—to those which may be confidently expected to pay the interest on the money borrowed by direct return to the Treasury. That principle had certainly not been previously followed, and I regret to say that I fear it has not since been followed to its full extent, and is not now followed. On the contrary, the last accounts from India show that the Viceroy has laid down an entirely different rule of his own. I believe that the order was not at all liked, and instead of complying, the Viceroy has substituted this rule. In effect he says: “Between the deficit on guaranteed railways and unpaying irrigation and other works, we already incur a loss of about two millions per annum; all we can undertake is not to increase that loss. But as one thing begins to pay, we hold ourselves free to embark in other unpaying schemes.” The consequence is that, as fast as the really paying guaranteed railways are completed and brought into full work and begin to pay the full interest, the Indian Government holds itself free to charge to “extraordinary” works of a different character which never will pay. Thus the present loss of two millions per annum will be perpetuated, even if it is not increased.

In dealing with the finance, we must distinguish between general good supposed to be done to the country—a good which cannot be ascertained exactly in figures—and direct pecuniary return. From a strict financial point of view, we can look only to the latter; or, at most, we can only further take into account direct money savings to Government. It will not suffice to say, “Oh, true there is not direct pecuniary return, but the prosperity of the country leads to increase of revenue, and that recoups the Government.” When I come to the main sources of revenue, I shall have to show that they are much less elastic than is generally supposed.

Again, then, I ask what have we to show for the deficit of the last ten years in the shape of works really yielding a direct profit sufficient to meet the interest on the money borrowed?

Well, the Government has taken over two or three very unpaying and insolvent concerns which private companies threw on its hands; it has built a good many very shuky barracks, many of which have proved very unsuitable; it has carried on several irrigation schemes; and it has made a commencement of several State railways. With respect to railways, the fact is that almost all the paying lines have been occupied by the guaranteed companies, and most of those taken up by the Government are the lines which are not likely to pay. Some were rejected by the companies as unprofitable. A great part of the Government lines are undertaken for political objects. I think the Northern Bengal line is the only one likely really to pay, and comparatively little has yet been spent on that. The irrigation works recently constructed or taken over

do not directly pay. I am aware that an official statement has been prepared by the Public Works Department to show that the canals do, as a whole, pay a certain moderate percentage. But departmental statements of this kind should be tested by independent authority. These figures are misleading in several ways. The old canals made by the native Governments are lumped up with recent canals which do not pay; the interest during construction is not taken into account; in some cases a portion of the land revenue is arbitrarily assigned to the canals. In spite of some evils, I do not doubt that the canals are in one way or other advantageous to the country. But there are difficulties, connected with the tenure of the land and otherwise, which must interfere with the prospect of direct profit. The subject is too large and difficult to enter on here. I will only say that it is principally in connection with the land revenue that real profit can be arrived at. If the *unearned increment* of the land is to come to the State, so may the indirect profit of irrigation railways and other public works, but not otherwise. Altogether, I do not think that above half the deficit of the last ten years can be attributed to works officially called reproductive; and I am sure that there is but a very small fraction of the whole expenditure which really pays fair interest on the money spent.

No doubt, on the statement which I have made, the argument commonly used suggests itself. It is said, "You admit that many of the works undertaken are in one shape or other beneficial to the country, is it not then good policy to borrow the money and make them?" I say, provided very great care and discrimination is used only to make really useful works, and not to follow the rush of opinion into works useful or useless, by all means make such works as you have money to make. The best guarantee for real care is the necessity of paying for them. And reverting to my view, that, situated as we are in India, we ought to save in time of prosperity, I say that the best way of investing such savings is in works which are really useful. I think, then, that the old Company's fashion of making works, which are thus indirectly beneficial, out of income, and not charging them to capital, was a good and sound one, which we may still with advantage follow. One of our Indian Finance Ministers (Mr. Massey, it was, I think) said with great truth that a large outlay on public works is an expenditure which may be retrenched at any time if necessity arises. I would have it then that we should so adjust our income and expenditure, that in time of peace and quiet we should have a clear annual surplus over inevitable expenditure of at least two or three millions per annum—I would myself rather say four or five millions—to provide for famines, great works, and everything else. I would quite approve the devoting of the surplus to works indirectly beneficial to the country, if we at the



same time keep a sufficient reserve to enable us to meet sudden emergencies without borrowing. I would not embark on works which cannot be thus met from revenue, excepting only in case of a clear and undoubted commercial investment, so likely to pay that a private capitalist would invest his money in it. A railway through a rich and populous part of India not yet provided for, and presenting no extraordinary engineering difficulties, would probably come under this last category; but, as a rule, neither our present State railways nor our recent irrigation works do.

We want, then, a surplus to enable us to meet unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure and great public works. What is our prospect of attaining that end? To deal with this part of the subject I must again glance back a little, and run over our Indian financial history in a very few words.

Under native rule the land revenue, pushed to a point almost or quite as high as rent—not unfrequently higher—is the mainstay of the finance. All other sources are merely subsidiary. These last took the shape of very frequent and vexatious transit duties, fees on trades and professions, fines, and extortions. From all these we have relieved the country. In lieu of the abolished transit duties we have imposed very moderate duties on most imports and on some exports. And we have created two great sources of revenue unknown to the natives—the opium revenue, which is practically an immense export duty, and the salt duty. Salt was subjected by the natives to petty duties like other articles; but in no native State, so far as I am aware, was it ever made the subject of very high duties and a special source of large revenue, such as it is to us. Our salt duty, though the people are now habituated to it, is distinctly a British as distinguished from a native tax. The excise on spirits and drugs, though much developed by us, had its beginning in the native system.

Stamps are merely a form of collecting revenue, and many kinds of revenue may be put under that head. In India stamps for the most part represent a tax on litigation, or perhaps it would be more proper to say fees to defray the cost of litigation. Recent apparent large increases in the stamp revenue are chiefly due to the transfer to stamps of large classes of court fees hitherto paid in cash. And so far as the increase is real there has been at least a corresponding increase in the cost of the courts. I would then hardly class stamps as a real source of revenue, a comparatively small receipt from light stamps on commercial documents excepted.

Our really effective Indian revenue is derived from five sources—land, opium, salt, excise, and customs—of which land yields somewhat more than all the others put together.

Down to the time of the Mutiny, the Company managed to carry

on the administration, including public works, from these sources. After the Mutiny, India had for a short time the benefit of the services of that very able financier the late Mr. James Wilson. Mr. Wilson considered, and I am inclined to think justly considered, that the altered circumstances of our position in the country, due to the discovery that we could no longer rely on a cheap native army, rendered necessary an increase of income. He imposed fresh taxation, notably the income-tax, also a large addition to the customs duties, some addition to the salt duty, and some other imposts. After the war came prosperity; very large amounts of English capital (borrowed, guaranteed, and private) were poured into the country. Partly as the result of this prosperity, and partly by the new plan of throwing off public works on extraordinary loans, it has been found possible to get rid of most of the additional taxation imposed by Mr. Wilson. It has been assumed that all the surplus of times of prosperity and something more can be applied to remission of taxation. In this way the whole of the new imposts affecting the rich and well-to-do—the income-tax, the enhanced customs duties, &c.—have been done away with; only that affecting the poor, the salt duty, has been maintained and further aggravated. In my opinion that is a very great injustice.

To see the course of Indian finance in the last ten years let us turn to pages 7 and seq. of the Statistical Abstract.

The prosperity subsequent to the Mutiny culminated in a considerable surplus in 1866. But very large sums were then spent on public works not always the most prudent. The military charges were still very high. There was a heavy deficit in the years 1868 and 1869, which much alarmed the Government of the late Lord Mayo. Stringent measures of retrenchment and some measures of taxation were resorted to, including a sudden increase of the income-tax in the middle of the year, which created more hubbub among the richer classes than perhaps it was worth.

Lord Mayo was a true friend of the people, and he had nothing more at heart than the mitigation of the salt duty in those parts of India where it pressed most heavily. It was mainly with this object that he clung to the income-tax. This he states very plainly in his minutes, and on that ground the income-tax was maintained at a moderate rate to the end of his reign.

Another very important measure of Lord Mayo's Government was the localisation of a portion of the finance. He desired to regulate the increase of the growing departments, so far as they were of a local character and dependent on local arrangements, views, and management, by giving to each local Government once for all a permanent grant slightly reduced from the grant of recent years, and calling on them to find all further sums that might be

required for the improvement of those departments from local sources. It is quite clear that Lord Mayo's Government contemplated possible fresh taxation by the provincial Governments in case the necessity arose and fitting means approved by the supreme Government could be devised. More especially Lord Mayo sought to restore local municipal institutions, and to promote among the people both a desire for improvements of which they directly reaped the benefit and a self-reliance founded on the necessity of paying for such improvements by local rates. This view was much pressed on the local Governments, and plans in that direction were taking shape when Lord Mayo died. The result of Lord Mayo's measures was that a surplus was again established. On the 31st March, 1872, a few weeks before the arrival of his successor, the accounts showed a surplus on the year of close on a million and a half sterling, all extraordinary disbursements included.

This prosperous state of things has since been very much altered, partly by remission of taxation and partly by extraordinary demands on the Treasury. In my opinion Lord Northbrook came to India too much inclined to the view, set about by those who most make themselves heard in India and accepted by many earnest men at home, that the people of India have been overburdened by recent attempts at direct and other taxation. I think he has too much put forward remission of taxation as the object to be aimed at, as distinguished from adjustment of taxation and the establishment of a safe balance. I think too much has been conceded to the rich and noisy, and too little to the poor. The income-tax has been abolished and some other concessions have been made, but the salt-tax remains unabated.

Following on Lord Northbrook's too confident reductions of taxation came the famine and some other demands. The surplus of 1871-2 gave place to a large deficit, which reached the sums of £5,360,975 in 1873-4, and £4,526,592 in 1874-5, extraordinary expenses included as in the previous account.

Since the famine-expenditure has ceased, the Government cannot hold out any better prospect than an equilibrium, to be attained if it is permitted to borrow for works called "extraordinary," and to keep them out of the account. The estimates for the present year show that, if no misfortune or unexpected charge of any kind occurs, if we have continued prosperity without war or famine, the Government expects a surplus of £506,000 only on the ordinary account, and a deficit of £3,794,000 if the extraordinary account be included. Since these estimates were framed we have very narrowly escaped a serious complication in Burmah, and I understand that there is again a scarcity in Behar, for which considerable expenses may possibly be incurred.

It is also the case that the expenditure on works *not* classed as "extraordinary" is much less than it was some years ago. Some of the provincial authorities complain that many improvements have been stopped in consequence of the famine in Bengal, and the Commander-in-Chief is aggrieved that military works are not carried forward as rapidly as in former years. The present estimates are the result of a somewhat severe economy in everything not classed as extraordinary.

Lord Mayo's plan of throwing on provinces and localities the burden of providing for local benefits by local taxes and rates has also been checked. The local Governments have not devised any new provincial taxation which commended itself to the Government of India. Some plans of the kind, proposed by the Government of Bombay, were, I believe rightly, negatived. The present Viceroy, in effect, broadly announced that no new taxes, imperial or provincial, would be sanctioned.

Lord Northbrook much discouraged all municipal arrangements which might result in taxation in any shape. An Act of the Bengal Legislature for reconstituting rural municipalities in Bengal, with permissive powers of rating in a very limited way, for sanitation, education, and other improvements, was vetoed by him on the ground that it might possibly lead to increase of taxation. I think it was hardly taken into account that in native times there is a very large self-imposed local taxation by the members of the village communities for their own objects.

One great experiment in local taxation for local purposes has been carried through, and I think I may presume to say that it is now on all hands admitted that it has been attended with extraordinary and unexpected success. I allude to the Bengal Road leep. I had the duty, on assuming the government of Bengal, of considering this subject, in accordance with Lord Mayo's wishes and those of the Secretary of State; and, with the assistance of men very experienced in the affairs of Bengal, I framed a measure which was passed by the Bengal Legislative Council, and received the assent of Lord Mayo. That measure also received the approval of the then Secretary of State, before the change of financial policy occurred in India, and was experimentally introduced in several districts. Lord Northbrook, for a time, looked on it with much suspicion, and prohibited its further extension; but I am bound to say that eventually he fairly permitted me to carry out the policy which had been sanctioned by her Majesty's Government, and gave me an honest support. The result has been that in the districts in which I tried it, rates imposed by local bodies for the construction and maintenance of local roads have been collected with a success which I may call astonishing. The system has been accepted almost without

a grumble, and the people seem quite sensible of the benefits which they are to derive from it. So completely is this admitted, that Sir R. Temple has proposed, and Lord Northbrook has sanctioned, the extension of the system to almost all the remaining districts of

This, then, brings our finance down to the present time. The income-tax and salt-tax apart, I do not think it can properly be said that we have subjected the people of India to severe taxation. So far from the land revenue being a heavy tax imposed by us, we have, by leaving a large margin to the proprietors whom we have established, created in their favour a vast and valuable property, which in this sense never existed before. The opium revenue is not paid by the people of India. The incidence of the customs and excise is very light. The richer natives are certainly among the most lightly-taxed people in the world. On the poor the salt-tax amounts to a poll-tax of about 8*d.* per head if we take the whole population of India, men, women, and children, together; but as the tax is paid in advance by the wholesale dealer, and is attended with many restrictions, it probably costs the consumers something near 1*s.* per head—say 5*s.* per family—that is, about 4 per cent. on the income of a labouring man earning 5 rupees or 10*s.* per month. In certain provinces, the duty being heavier, the incidence of the tax is much heavier.

Notwithstanding what I have said, I have never committed myself to advocate the continuance of the income-tax as an imperial tax. The decision has not rested with me, and I have suspended my judgment. It was my duty to collect the tax, and this I can say, that it has never been well assessed or put on a satisfactory footing. It was very roughly assessed at first—more successfully, however, than might have been expected. Since then the Government has never fully faced the question of making the tax a permanent resource. It has been continued from time to time. This has been conceded and that to those who are aggrieved. Much complaint was thus appeased, but the income was more and more attenuated. It was quite necessary either to take the tax in hand, readjust it, and impose it properly, or to abandon it. The plan to which I inclined was to localise it, throwing certain burdens on localities and giving them the income-tax to manipulate in their own way. At any rate I have said, and will continue to say, that while no relief was given to the poor, the tax should not have been taken off the rich without finding a substitute for it.

However, the income-tax has gone, and Indian finance is, as it were, reduced to its original elements—the old-fashioned sources of income which existed before the Mutiny. Do these old-fashioned sources give promise of increase sufficient to meet an expenditure

which inevitably increases, and to provide for those things which I have tried to show that prudence requires? That I must examine.

I have stated the five sources of real revenue—land, opium, salt, excise, and customs. I will go over them seriatim.

The Indian land revenue is one of those subjects about which one feels that the further one goes the more difficult it is. After having, I may almost say, devoted myself to the subject for upwards of thirty years, I have hardly arrived at confident conclusions. My views have been opposed to a permanent settlement, in the form at least in which we know it. I have inclined to the maintenance of the native system, under which, in one shape or other, almost the whole rent comes to the State, and is the public fund by which the functions of Government are carried on. Under that system the customary rents are either collected by the State direct or taken through middlemen who receive a percentage for their trouble and whose tenure is contingent on their good behaviour.

So long as this system is maintained, strong ideas regarding the rights of property in land do not arise. While we administer the native system without native tyranny and caprice, small farmers who hold with perfect security of tenure, so long as they pay moderate rents, are well content; and the middleman who retains his functions and his percentage, so long as he performs his duties honestly and efficiently, quite accepts the situation.

But once landed property in the English form is created, things become very different. When estates have acquired a marketable value, and are bought and sold, very strong interests arise, which energetically resist the increase of revenue at the will of the State officials. And under a system which gives the rich and influential great power in the press, and great means of swaying public opinion, it becomes more and more difficult to keep the Government revenue up to its former scale. Even where Government deals direct with the ryots, the classes which formerly contentedly paid a full rent, so soon as they have become accustomed to a property giving a large margin of income, against which they can borrow and spend, greatly resent any sudden and serious reduction of that income. In Lord Cornwallis's time the Zemeindar had only 10 per cent. of the revenue, and he performed gratuitously many duties for which we now pay heavily. Later on the rule was laid down that the proprietors should keep one-third of the rent, paying two-thirds to Government, and on that basis the settlements were concluded for thirty years. Since then peace, prosperity, and public works have done much for the country, the value of the land and the free income of the proprietors has greatly increased. The State now demands only half the rent. Even that half should be more than

the two-thirds of former days. But the men who have till now paid only the light assessment made in a former generation, and who have learned to spend and borrow and mortgage on the strength of the large income accruing to them, feel bitterly a revision of assessment which diminishes their free income. There is more and more cry for "consideration" and "moderation of assessments." The land revenue does not increase in proportion to the increased value of the country; the indirect benefit of railways and canals is not fully reaped by the State. True, up to this time considerable additions have been made to the assessments in some provinces, and frequent accessions of territory have contributed to swell the land revenue; but further accessions of territory we do not now look for, and there is at present a strong tendency to reaction against increased assessments. On the whole, notwithstanding my long-standing partiality for the old system of retaining the rent as the State fund and so avoiding other taxation, I begin to think that we shall come to a permanent settlement in one shape or other. I fear that, as things are now going, we neither obtain an increase of revenue proportioned to the increased value of the land and our increased expenses, nor do we give that security against variable assessments at the will of the Government which seems to be requisite to a fair trial of the English system of property in land. If I had absolute power, perhaps I might still revert to the old system; but to do so would be little short of a revolution; and unless potent forces bring that about, I am coming to the belief that we shall have to accept a permanent settlement and look to other forms of taxation.

By a permanent settlement I mean one under which the payments are at least regulated by a fixed scale, and no longer depend on the will of the Government, nor on rents which may some day to some extent represent the investment of capital. The best compromise is probably that which would give for ever a revenue of the character of grain rents, that is payments to be regulated every few years by the price of the staple articles of production.

To derive real social and political benefit from such a fixity of assessment, the measure must not be limited to the highest class connected with the land, but must extend to all the lower grades of persons having a real interest in the soil. There is no so great source of weakness to us as the necessity of maintaining weak landlords against energetic sub-holders deprived of the sacred right of rebellion. For instance, in my view, our only danger from what is called Mahommedan fanaticism is in cases where religion is merely used as a bond to unite a peasantry who believe that they have agrarian grievances. It would be necessary to make some special provision for the effect of Government irrigation works.

For the present I am convinced that, in the absence of any

revolution in our land policy, we have already obtained and taken credit for almost all the increase of land revenue that we are likely to get for some time to come. Most of our present settlements must now run for twenty or thirty years, and so far from a general prospect of early increase, there is, on the contrary, a great disposition to reduce settlements made when the price of cotton was high and agricultural affairs at high tide. Several such reductions have lately been sanctioned. It seems now to be established that the Americans have succeeded in placing their cotton cultivation on as high a footing as before the war. I fear India cannot rival American cotton in quality. It so happens that cotton is not only our most valuable export, but is produced in the districts where we have the greatest power to raise the revenue as the value of produce increases. The rice and jute and other great exports of Bengal and parts of Madras, indeed I may say the bulk of our exports from that side of India, and those most capable of development, come from permanently settled provinces, where no increase of land revenue is possible. I say advisedly that, in revising our finances, we must not count on further rapid increase of the land revenue at present.

Next in financial order stands the opium revenue. We have the highest official authority for the view that we ought not to rely on the permanence of this branch of our revenue. Lord Mayo thought so; recent and present Secretaries of State have declared so. Yet there is a comfortable under-current of belief that the opium revenue has continued to increase in spite of all sinister forebodings, and that it may well continue still to increase and flourish. So long as the political circumstances remain as they are, it may well be that, despite occasional fluctuations, our opium revenue may be maintained. But I am very deliberately of opinion that it will not continue to develop as it has in past years, and I will explain why.

The increase of the indigenous cultivation in China is now beyond doubt. Yet it may be that the unhappy spread of a taste for the drug among the Chinese population would leave room enough both for the inferior indigenous and for the superior foreign drug. If we could have supplied it at the price which was formerly thought the safest, that is at 1,000 or 1,100 rupees per chest, we might have held our own in the competition, and we should still have levied, in practice, an export duty of nearly 200 per cent. This was the policy at which Lord Mayo's Government aimed. It was intended to increase the quantity of Indian opium supplied so as to keep down the price to a level, which would compete advantageously with the Chinese and all other opiums. And no doubt, looking at the matter commercially, this was the right policy. But it turns out that the attempt to extend the



production has been unsuccessful; it almost looks as if we had reached the limits of our powers in that way, unless inducements are held out such as would much detract from the profit. Instead of an average of 60,000 chests of Bengal opium as was intended, we have only got about 45,000 chests. Consequently the price has gone up very much. From the smaller quantity we have made more than we expected to make from the larger quantity. The immediate financial effect has been favourable. If there were no competition this would be an excellent result. But the fear is that the high prices of the last few years are killing the goose that lays the eggs. These prices are giving a very great stimulus to the growth in China; and even if we still sell our drug well, I do not think that with our present production the revenue can continue to increase; we shall be very lucky if we maintain it at the high level of recent years. This is supposing political conditions to remain as they are. But there are dangers which cannot be concealed. There is not only the danger of open war with China, but there is the possibility that China may become strong enough to take her own way in this matter; to say, "We always have objected to this trade, and we are determined to put a stop to it." There is the possibility that the conscience of England may be awakened by those who take a strong view of this matter till the country says, "We will not force opium on the Chinese; they may do as they like." Finally, after the experience of the potato and the vine, we must always feel that a highly centralised cultivation of a single plant continued year after year and generation after generation in the same districts is very liable to be interrupted by great blights. We have had some rather alarming appearances among the poppy plants of late years, and cannot but take into account that a blight might upset all our opium revenue.

I come to the conclusion, then, that, if all goes well, we may hope to retain our opium revenue, but cannot look to increase it rapidly as it has heretofore increased. At the same time, that revenue is one peculiarly exposed to risks by which it may be lost, and we certainly ought not to calculate too confidently on it.

I have seen the salt-duty triumphantly instanced as a revenue progressive in a most gratifying degree. How far this is true a brief statement at page 39 of the last "Moral and Material Progress Report" enables us to judge. True, the revenue has doubled since the Mutiny, but most of the increase is due to the increased taxation which a stricter and more organised system has enabled us to impose. In the period from 1857 to 1874, which the compiler of the report takes, the rate of salt duty in Madras and Bombay has been much more than doubled; in the North-West Provinces and Punjab it has been increased 50 per cent.; and in Bengal it has been

increased 30 per cent. We must look to the quantity consumed. The compiler says that there has been an increase in the quantity on which duty is paid of about 16 per cent. in seventeen years. Now<sup>a</sup> in that time the whole of Oude (which not only made its own salt, but smuggled largely into our districts) has been brought within our salt customs system; also several other districts. The manufacture of earth salt in several parts of India has been put down. A more complete authority and system have enabled us nearly to put down the wholesale and violent smuggling across the internal salt line which used to prevail. Making all these deductions from an increase of 16 per cent. on the whole, I do not think it can be said that the increase in the consumption of salt has gone beyond the natural increase of population, but quite the contrary. We have succeeded in raising heavier salt duties, but all the increased facilities of carriage and trade have not sufficed to lead to real increase of consumption in the face of the increased duties. Accustomed to a salt duty as the people are, it is nevertheless attended with many disadvantages. I have shown that it is, in fact, a heavy poll-tax on the poor—heavier than any income-tax that we have imposed on the rich. It limits the consumption by the people of a necessary of life and health, and it almost entirely prevents the use of salt for cattle. It is also rendered impossible to use salt for the purposes of curing; and no one who has observed how much dried fish enters into the food of the people of Bengal and other parts of India, and how offensive it is when dried without salt, can doubt that this is a great evil. Still, if the salt duty is to be maintained as a large source of income, I cannot doubt that recent increases in the Madras and Bombay duty are justified as a step towards equalisation. In those Presidencies Government salt is now sold at the rate of two rupees, or 4s. per maund of 80 lbs., which means that it is charged with a duty of about 3s. 6d. per maund. In Bengal the duty is 6s. 6d. per maund, and the sale price at place of debarkation about 8s. per maund; and in the North-West Provinces and Punjab the duty is nearly as high. It was Lord Mayo's intention to use the additional revenue obtained in Madras and Bombay in order to let down the duty in Northern India, where it presses with undue severity and reduces the consumption far below that prevailing in other parts of India. In my opinion that is the right course. The salt revenue, instead of being further increased, should be somewhat diminished.

The excise revenue derived from spirits and drugs now amounts to about £2,300,000 gross. The system lately followed has been to increase the rate of tax, although we thereby diminish the quantity on which duty is paid, the object being to derive the largest revenue from the smallest consumption. And this policy has been very successful. I think that the excise revenue may be expected to gain in propor-

tion to the wealth and population of the country. But it is only a minor source of income, and God forbid that we should so spread a taste for drinking as to give it a great position in our finance.

There remains the customs, in which you are particularly interested. The whole customs duties were before the late changes about £2,600,000, of which about two-thirds were derived from imports and about one-third from exports. Lord Northbrook has abandoned upwards of £300,000<sup>1</sup> of this revenue. Of the remainder about £900,000 is directly derived from the duties on cotton goods, the abolition of which you demand, and about £400,000 from wines and liquors, which must remain so long as there is an excise on those articles. I have no doubt it would be found that there are many other goods so much connected with or affiliated to the cotton trade, that if the cotton duties go they must go too—so that, in fact, the bulk of our import duties would be gone. I do not think the duties on metals are politic, and they, too, are so far protective. A successful iron manufacture on European methods may any day spring up. My impression is that if the cotton duties go all import duties except those on articles on which an excise is levied in India must go. Then the remaining export duties on grain, indigo, and lac must go, and we shall have complete free trade except in salt and spirituous liquors. That is, I dare say, a consummation very much to be desired; but it involves the loss of upwards of two millions of revenue, which must be replaced somehow.

We have so little information, that I am hardly prepared to speak of the late changes in the customs introduced by Lord Northbrook's Government. I do not at all understand why it was necessary to do so without giving either the independent members of the Viceroy's Council and the Indian public on the one hand, or the Secretary of State and his Council on the other, any opportunity of saying a word on the matter. I do not quite see why some import duties were reduced without any urgent demand, while the cotton duties, which you may force the Government to abandon, remain. The import duty on American cotton seems fair enough in itself, but raises difficult questions without really settling anything, and has caused much irritation. The abolition of a number of the export duties on articles of which we have no monopoly was I think right.

I have now gone over the sources of the Indian revenue. What I have said will have shown that I do not think it likely to increase greatly by mere natural development for some time to come.

Can we diminish the charges? I think not. The fact is that, putting aside the policy of abandoning some of the sources of revenue without a substitute, the ordinary finances of India have been very

(1) Gross remissions, £408,000; net ditto, £308,000; [£100,000 being gained on spirits and wines.

well and carefully administered for some years past, with great regard to economy. Almost all possible retrenchments have been made, and little remains to do in that direction. On the other hand, prices continue to rise while the value of silver falls; and there are many things in which there must be a progressive increase of expenditure, due both to what may be called natural growth and to the ever-increasing demands of an improved administration. New wants and demands are continually developed, and must be met if we are to keep pace with modern standards. This tendency is already apparent. Notwithstanding all the watchful care of Lord Northbrook, the last accounts show that it has been necessary to concede a considerable increase of expenditure in several branches and on the whole. The increase of expenditure in the estimates for the present year is upwards of a million; and even if we attribute half of that excess to exceptional causes connected with guaranteed railways and exchange, there is still an increase in army and other charges amounting to about half a million, which marks an increasing expenditure not to be avoided.

The great item of charge is the army, in which, after many reductions and economies have been made, there is now an increase on the last estimates, and in respect of which there is a very strong demand for improvements involving further increase of charge. Whether anything ought to be conceded to the cry for more European officers for the native army I will not say—I rather hope not; but there is little doubt that some increase must be conceded in the pay of the native soldiers. Both the gradual rise of wages in the labour market and recent changes in the system of the British army in the direction of short service (which will necessitate the offering special terms for service in India) must make the European soldier a continually increasing expense. The cost of modern arms and appliances also continually increases. I fear that, the numbers remaining the same, we cannot hope to avoid some gradual increase in the cost of the army. I am very clear that the numbers of the army cannot be reduced. We have 180,000 men all told, including sick, men on furlough, and non-effectives of every kind. We have no militia or reserves of any sort. Such a force, for so enormous a country, with so great a population, and so many native states with armies of their own, is smaller in proportion than almost any army in the world. It cannot be reduced. In truth, when we deduct from a force of say 150,000 effectives the men absolutely required for the enormous number of garrisons and guards, which are indispensable throughout the length and breadth of so great a country held by a foreign rule, the number that we could collect in any one army in the field is wonderfully small, judged by any European standard. We cannot put out of sight the fact that political complications may

arise, and I do not think we can avoid in our calculations the possible contingency of an increase of the army in India rendered necessary by such circumstances. My fear of Russia and the Central Asia Question is not that we need entertain serious apprehensions of a collision on the north-west frontier for a generation at least, but that the advance of Russia and the feelings on the subject excited in this country may drive us to precautionary measures which will increase our military charges and very unfavourably affect our finances. On the side of Egypt also complications may arise. We won't say more of that now. Burmah is a country where we have one foot, but not both, and any serious difficulty involving an advance there would render necessary the occupation of a very large territory. Beyond Burmah is China, and unfortunately there are many indications that serious questions with China may not be distant. Altogether, I greatly fear that it is impossible to make our finance safe and prudent without allowance for the not improbable event of increased military charges from one cause or another.

The marine charges, too, have been reduced to a point so low that an increase has been found indispensable, even if demands are not made on behalf of the British navy.

In the civil charges, again, I do not think we can expect further savings. If here and there something can be saved, the gain will be more than absorbed by the demands for modern improvements to which I have alluded. The charges connected with the administration of justice are always increasing; additions to the pay of native judges, extensions to meet increasing and more complicated litigation, and other demands, cause the increase. Hitherto this increase has been met by increase in the stamp revenues, and I set one off against the other. But we have perhaps pushed to extreme the anti-Benthamite principle of making litigation pay for itself. The stamp duties charged on legal proceedings have been increased, and it was supposed to be a good thing to discourage litigation. To take a good slice of the proceeds of litigation from the successful suitor is quite in accordance with native tradition and custom. We charge the suitor at his entrance to the hall of justice. But it may be doubted if the end we desire to attain is really achieved. In India litigation is both the excitement and luxury of the rich, and the means by which the poor are coerced. The rich man willingly pays the fees required for the privilege of going into court. But there has been of late very much reason to fear that the taxes imposed in classes of cases in which the poor are especially interested, and which were formerly almost free, have led to serious denial of justice. It has been necessary to make some relaxation in these cases, and further concessions may be necessary.

The sum of my views on the financial situation in India is this.

The great attention given to finance by the late and present Viceroys and the careful economies effected by them had this effect, that if taxation had been maintained at the point where Lord Mayo left it there would now have been, as a little time ago there was, a surplus of about two millions on the ordinary and regular expenditure, famines and other contingencies apart, and some really paying or what we may call mercantile works being charged to a separate capital account. Famines and extraordinary civil demands might have been met from the surplus, but not wars and the great works which do not pay. Lord Northbrook's remissions of taxation have reduced the margin to half a million according to the last accounts—so that we have now really no considerable margin over the regular allotted and certain expenditure to meet famines and other contingencies and defray the cost of great works. I say that we must calculate on the occasional occurrence of famines and other unascertained contingencies and expenses. I say that as we are situated, we ought in time of peace form a reserve fund to meet probable political complications and possible military operations. I say that the greater proportion of the public works now charged as "extraordinary" will not yield to Government a net return to pay the interest accruing on the money borrowed, and that therefore it is not safe or right, financially speaking, to charge such works to capital. And with these views I argue that a mere equilibrium between the receipts and ascertained ordinary charges is not sufficient—that a large margin should be provided.

I further express the opinion that we have made the most of our present sources of revenue, and are not likely in the years to come to derive from them large and rapid increase of income. Some of the chief of our resources are, I think, subject to risk of diminution by external circumstances or exposed to just demands for abatement. I apprehend that continual increase of charges which has been found to be inevitable. In short, I think our expenditure is more likely to increase than our income and in greater proportion. At best, even if we hold our own under the present system, I see no prospect of that margin over ordinary expenditure to meet occasional demands and public works which I think necessary.

Five years ago I had occasion to review the finances of India. I then expressed opinions very similar to those which I now hold. I have been looking over the figures, and I think they confirm the views I held then and hold now. The revenues have increased with extreme slowness in the last five years and, after two millions of assessed taxes given up, the estimated receipts of 1875-6 are a million and a half less than in 1870-1, being only £49,800,000 against £51,413,000 in the former year. The expenses including extraordinary are, on the other hand, upwards of two and a half millions in excess of the

former year—£53,600,000 to £51,000,000—and our financial condition is thus upwards of four millions worse. The public works, ordinary and extraordinary together, stand at £5,200,000 in 1870-1, £7,200,000 in 1875-6; so that the State railways may account for half the difference and the remission of taxation for the other half. There has been little gain in other quarters to set against that remission, and we have a large deficit on the whole instead of a small surplus.

What, then, is to be done? I confess that in my view it is not possible to make the financial reforms which successive heads of the administration have held to be desirable—to mitigate the salt-tax on the poor, or to remit the customs duties which have to some extent a protective effect—without increasing our resources from some quarter. I do not think it safe to go on as at present, relegating expenditure to an “extraordinary” account, without some such adjustment.

If it be conceded that increased means must be found, then I think we must choose between two courses—increase of the land revenue, or taxation in other shapes. Either we must revert to the native view of land management, taking the bulk of the rent for the State, and leaving to the occupants and middlemen merely a privileged occupancy and a fair remuneration for the duties of collection and management; or, if we keep to the English view of property according to modern patterns, then we must also introduce modern forms of taxation, and so redress the balance. I do not take upon myself to say which course should be adopted, for I do not think it in practice probable that we really shall adopt and firmly carry out the former course; and therefore I apprehend that it probably will be necessary to revert to the course which our post-Mutiny financiers, from Mr. Wilson to Lord Mayo, have adopted, but which Lord Northbrook has abandoned—that is, the imposition of some taxes in addition to those which sufficed before the Mutiny. I think they should be taxes on the rich and well-to-do more especially. Those taxes may be imperial, provincial, or local. I strongly hold that the reforms you desire cannot be effected without them. I do not now go further into the question. I have only indicated to you what I believe to be our position.

It is not possible that I should enter on the machinery of government by which the finances of India are managed and controlled. That is a very large and separate subject. I may say, however, that I think there is a want of any one centralised authority, and of any continuity of policy and system, by which great results might be worked out. We seem too much to drift with the tide, or to follow the changing opinions of individuals high in office.

Nominally, according to the letter of the law, a very great power

over the finances is vested in the Council of India in this country. But in practice much of this power is illusory, and the Council does not fully exercise any real power that it has. A Viceroy who has views of his own may sometimes carry them out without much regard to the Home Government. For instance, it is certain that Lord Northbrook thought proper to make the late changes in the customs arrangements without giving the least information to the Home Government, so that the Indian Council had no opportunity whatever of expressing their views or exercising any influence one way or other.

Again, although no expenditure can be sanctioned by the Secretary of State without the consent of his Council, he might in the Secret department direct the Viceroy to enter into a war, or to make military or political dispositions involving enormous charges or enormous sacrifices, entirely without the knowledge of the Council. Telegrams, too, seem in practice exempt from the control of the Council; and in other ways, when there is a complete understanding between the Viceroy and the Secretary for State, much influence may be exercised without formal orders passing before the Council.

Even as regards those things in which the Council might have real power, its members have little cohesion as a body, and I think it is generally felt by the members of the Council themselves that they do not stand so firmly on opinions of their own and exercise that substantial control over expenditure which the Legislature seems to have contemplated.

I think the periodical overhaul of the Indian machine which took place while the Company existed was beneficial in many ways; and now that a considerable period has elapsed since the Crown assumed the Government, the time is approaching when another overhaul would be very desirable.

G. CAMPBELL.



## DUTCH GUIANA.<sup>1</sup>

### CHAPTER V.

#### BUSH - NEGROES.

THE groups that had gathered to greet us as we landed at the large wooden "stelling" in front of La Paix, had an appearance not unbefitting the general character of the place itself. Mixed together, yet distinct, the slender ornament-circled limbs and cringing gestures of the turbaned Coolies by the wharf, contrasted strangely with the sturdy forms and independent demeanour of the Bush-negroes, here present in great force, mixed up with the more disciplined Creoles, many of whom were, however, scarcely more over-burdened with apparel—or, rather, sensible of the want of it—than their Maroon kinsmen around. There was no lack of that general good feeling and willing subordination that characterized the more civilised population nearer the capital; all were cheerful—the Coolies, perhaps, excepted, but cheerfulness is not a Hindoo virtue either at home or abroad—and courteous, after a fashion, but somewhat wild.

A painted four-oar-boat, with its commodious stern-cabin—the overseer's conveyance—lay alongside the wharf; two broad, flat-bottomed barges were moored some way up the main creek that leads to the interior of the estate; and besides these were a dozen Maroon corials, mere hollow tree-trunks, the simplest forms of barbaric invention—survivals, to borrow Mr. Tylor's excellent nomenclature, of a præ-civilised era in river navigation.

The owners of the corials—tall, well-shaped men of colour, ranging between dark brown and inky black, with a rag at most bound turban-fashion round their bullet heads, and another of scarce ampler dimensions about their loins—muster on the landing-place, and salute the Governor with a courteous deference to which the fullest uniform could add nothing. The women, whose dress may best be described as a scanty kilt, and the children, boys and girls, who have none to describe, keep somewhat in the background—laughing, of course; all seem perfectly at home, without strangeness, or even shyness of any kind. Nor, indeed, are they strangers from far off; their villages, on the banks of the upper Cottica itself, and of its tributary stream, the Coermotibo, are almost contiguous to the European estates. The main body of the tribe is, however, far away on the banks of the Saara River to the South, where their chief resides, and along the

(1) See *Fortnightly Review* for December, 1875, and February, 1876.]

west bank of the Maraweyn, the boundary river between Dutch and French Guiana. All this vast region, said by the few explorers who have visited it to be in no respect inferior for its fertility and the variety of its products to the best lands of Surinam, has been made over, partly by express treaty, partly by custom, to the Maroons, commonly known as the Bush-negroes, the first who in 1761 obtained a formal recognition of freedom and independence from their European masters. Of the entire district they are now almost the sole occupants, undisturbed even by dark-skinned competitors; for the Indian aborigines, believed to have been once numerous throughout these wooded valleys, have wasted away, and disappeared, unable not merely to compete but even to co-exist with their African any better than with their European neighbours. A small Dutch settlement—that of Albina, on the banks of the Maroweyn—alone varies the uniformity of negro possession in these lands.

Their mode of life is agricultural; their labour is partly bestowed on the field-produce sufficient to their own personal wants, partly on the growth and export of rice, with which they supply the estates and the capital. But their chief occupation is wood-cutting, and their skill in this department has secured them an almost absolute monopoly of the timber supply that forms a considerable item in the trade-lists of Surinam. They hew, trim, divide the planks, and do whatever is requisite for preparing the wood for shipment; then bring it down in the form of rafts or boat-loads to Paramaribo, where they exchange it most commonly for arms, powder, cooking utensils, and other household necessities. Fortunately for themselves, strong drink is not a favourite article of barter among these unregistered and unbaptized disciples of Father Mathew and Sir Wilfrid Lawson. Indeed, in this, as in many other respects, they present an advantageous contrast with the besotted Indians, whose diminution and almost disappearance from the land has been occasioned by intemperance much more than by any of the numerous causes assigned on philo-indigenous platforms. With the negro, on the contrary, drunkenness is an exotic vice, and even where it has been implanted it does not flourish largely on his soil.

Their settlements, far up among the rivers, and in regions said to be admirably adapted for cultivation, though as yet rarely favoured by European visitors, are grouped together after the fashion of small villages, resembling, I am told, in their principal features the more accessible hamlet inhabited by emancipated Congo Africans, and called "Bel Air," near Berbice. Their dwellings are reported to be neat and comfortable enough after a fashion. About fifty of these villages are recorded by name; the average number of souls in each equals three hundred, or thereabouts. The census of the entire Bush-negro population is almost conjectural; some bring their

numbers down to eight thousand, others raise them to thirty. Of the two extremes the latter is, I believe, the nearest to the truth. Negroes, like other Eastern tribes, when required to give an account of themselves, are in the habit of reckoning up their men only, omitting the women altogether, and even the male children if still at the breast. Fear of taxation is another common motive for understatement, especially in the presence of official inquiry. Every village has its chief; his office is partly hereditary, partly elective, and he himself is distinguished from his subjects by a uniform, to be worn, however, only on rare and special occasions—a fortunate circumstance in so warm a climate. He also bears a staff of office. These lesser chiefs are, again, under the orders of the headman of the tribe, who has right to wear, when he chooses—a rare occurrence, let us hope—a general's uniform, and to bear in his hand a bâton of rule surmounted by a gilded knob.

Besides the "grand man" of their own "skin," in negro phrase, each tribe enjoys or endures the presence of a European official whom the Colonial Government appoints under the title of "Post-houder," to reside among them, and whose duties chiefly consist in settling the frequent petty contentions that arise between the villagers themselves or their neighbours, regarding rights of property or land. Most other cases, civil or criminal, fall under the jurisdiction of the tribe itself, and are decided by the unwritten code of usage—often sufficiently barbarous in the punishments that it awards; though the cruellest of all, that of burning alive, is said not to have been inflicted on any one for a generation past. It was the penalty especially reserved for sorcerers, and its discontinuance is attributed to the fact that the sorcerers have themselves, like the witches of Germany or Scotland, disappeared in our day. The truth is that the negroes are less superstitious than of old, and having discarded the imaginary crime from their belief, have also discarded the real one by which it was supplemented from their practice—just as the erasure of heresy from the catalogue of sins was immediately followed by the extinction of heretic-burning faggots. The beneficent triumphs of Rationalism, so ably chronicled by Mr. Lecky, are not confined to Europe and the European races, and the process of the suns brings wider thoughts to other men than the dwellers of the moorland by Locksley Hall.

Sorcerers, indeed, have, it is said, though from what cause I cannot readily determine, been of all times rare articles among the negro colonists of Surinam. So, too, though the large majority of the Bush-negroes are yet pagans—as were their ancestors before them, when, cutlass in hand, they hewed out their way to freedom—Obeah, so notoriously widespread throughout Africa, and, if report say true, not unknown to some West-Indian regions, is scarcely ever heard of

among them. Yet, did it exist in any notable degree, it could hardly have failed, by the natural contagion of evil, to have established itself also among the Creole blacks, their immediate neighbours and kinsmen, who are, however, in general remarkably free from any imputation of the kind. Nor, again, are the Bush-negroes—nowadays at least—addicted to the indiscriminate fetish worship so often described by modern travellers as prevalent in Africa. Perhaps they may have been so formerly. At present the “coiba” or “cotton-tree,” that noblest forest-growth of the West Indies, enjoys almost alone, if report says true, the honours of negro worship, avowedly among the Maroons, furtively in the Creole villages. I myself have often seen the traces of offerings—fowls, yams, libations of drink, and the like—scattered round its stem; the spirit-dweller of its branches, thus propitiated, is said to be of an amiable disposition; unlike its demon-brother of the poison-tree, or Hiari, also venerated by some, but out of fear. Idols in the strict sense of the term they certainly have none; and their rejection of Roman Catholicism, a circumstance to which I have alluded before, is asserted to have had at least for its ostensible motive their dislike of the image-worship embodied in that system.

I would willingly indulge the charitable hope that the Moravian Bush-negro converts may possibly have acquired some kind of idea of the virtue commonly designated, though in a restricted use of the word, by the name of morality. It is a virtue with which their Pagan brethren are, in a general way, lamentably unacquainted. On principle, if the phrase may be allowed, they are polygamists; but the frequency of divorce renders, it is said, the dignity of a Bush-negro's wife more often successional than simultaneous. Indeed their avowed laxity in this and analogous directions is sometimes asserted, but how truly I cannot say, to be one of the chief hindrances to the increase of their numbers. Without going into the particulars of an obscure and unpleasant subject, thus much is clear, that a child which has for its parents “no father and not much of a mother,” a normal condition of things in the Bush-negro villages, must necessarily commence the infantile struggle for life under somewhat disadvantageous conditions. To this may be added a total absence of medical practitioners; a circumstance which however might, by a cynical mind, be rather reckoned among the counter-balancing advantages of forest existence.

In form and stature the Bush-negroes of Surinam may rank among the best specimens of the Ethiopian type; the men are often six feet and more in height, with well-developed limbs and pleasing open countenances; and the women in every physical respect are, to say the least, worthy of their mates. Ill-modelled trunks and disproportioned limbs are, in fact, as rare among them as they are

common among some lighter-complexioned races. Their colour is in general very dark, and gives no token of the gradual tendency to assume a fairer tint that may be observed among the descendants of negroes resident in more northerly latitudes; their hair, too, is as curly as that of any Niam-niam or Darfooree chief, or native of Senegal. I have heard it asserted more often than once, that by long domicilement in the South American continent, the negro type has a tendency to mould itself into one approaching that of the Indian aboriginal; and something of the kind might be looked for, if anywhere, among the Bush-negroes of the Surinam interior. But in the specimens that I saw, and they were many, I could not detect any such modification.

Their language is a curious and uncouth mixture. When it is analysed, English appears to form its basis; next on the list of contributors comes Portuguese, then Dutch, besides a sprinkling of genuine African words thrown in at random; and the thick soft African pronunciation over all. But of this jargon the negroes themselves make no use in writing, for which they employ Dutch, thereby showing themselves in this respect possessed of a truer feeling of the fitness of things than, I regret to say, their Moravian friends, who have taken superfluous pains to translate books of instruction and devotion into the so-called "negro language" for the supposed benefit of their half-tamed scholars—an instance, one amongst many, of being too practical by half.

Fortunately for the Bush-negroes themselves, their ultimate tendency in language, as in everything else, is to uniformity with the general Creole colonial type; one not of the very highest, it may be, but much superior to the half or three-quarters savagery in which they at present live. Their little, and, so to speak, accidental nationality, is composed of elements too feeble, and too loosely put together, not to be ultimately reabsorbed into the more vigorous and better constructed mass to which, though under differing conditions, it once belonged. Old mistrusts and antipathies are fast wearing themselves out in the daily contact with European life; and contact with Europeans never fails to produce, where negroes are concerned, first imitation, then assimilation. So long as slavery lasted, this was of course an impossibility for the Bush-negroes; it is now a mere question of time, longer or shorter according to the discretion and tact of the Colonial Government itself. And we may reasonably hope that the sagacity and moderation by which that same Government has thus far always distinguished itself will not fail it in this matter either.

Freedom from taxation and internal autonomy are the special privileges which the Bush-negroes in their present condition enjoy; by the latter they set some store, by the former much. On the other

hand they are fully aware of the greater advantages and enjoyments of a more settled and civilised form of life than their own, and would sacrifice much to make it theirs. The result of the exchange would be undoubtedly a very beneficial one, not only to the Bush-negroes themselves but to the colony at large. Labour is the one great requisite of Surinam; rich in every gift of unassisted nature, she is poor of that which alone could enable her to make profit of these gifts. In these Maroon subjects of hers close at hand she possesses a copious and as yet an unemployed reserve force of labour, superior in most respects to the Coolie or Chinese article, and, which is a main point, cheaper by far. The complete incorporation into colonial life and work of the negro element, now comparatively isolated and wasted in the bush, would add about a third to the progressiveness and energy of Dutch Surinam.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### MUNNICKENDAM.

"Not a word, a word, we stand upon our manners.  
Come, strike up." (*Music: here a dance.*)

SHAKESPEARE.

BUSH-NEGROES are fine fellows of their kind; I have seldom seen finer. Indians are, within certain limits, picturesque; Chinese, if not ornamental, are decidedly useful; and Coolies, though not unfrequently neither, are sometimes both. But, after all said, to be innocuous is the Indian's highest praise; and any notable increase in West-Indian lands of "Celestials" is—for reasons not all celestial, but much the reverse—not a thing to be desired; while Coolies are expensive to import, and, as settlers, offer but a dubious future. Negroes, with all their defects, are now, as of old times, West-Indian labour's best hope; and since "salt-water" blacks and purchased gangs are no longer to be had, Creole negroes must to the fore. In this view, if in no other, they are worth study, and where can we study them better than at Munnickendam?

And here I would like, though I am not going to do it, to insert a sketch of the little village—not so little, neither—near Bel-Air, on the way to Berbice, where live the liberated Congoites, or Congoese, or Congonians, rescued by our cruisers from the slave-ships to which they had already been consigned, and brought hither at a recent date. It is a village absolutely picturesque in its details; and what is, perhaps, more to the purpose, it offers to view in itself, and in its garden surroundings, abundant evidence of industry, skill, and the manly independence that lives by its own labour, and is content

to live so. Another sketch, too, I would willingly give—that of the new quarter of Paramaribo, the one, I mean, situated on the westernmost outskirts of the town, and called “The Plain of the 13th May.” That date last year was the jubilee of the Dutch king’s reign, and to celebrate the occasion the governor had offered prizes to the negro workmen who would best excel in laying out the roads and digging the trenches of the proposed suburb. It was opened on the day itself with great pomp and ceremony, and distribution of rewards, by his Excellency in person, and was at once made over to its present inhabitants, a class resembling in every respect the tenants of Bel-Air. A pretty patchwork of cottages and gardens, well-doing, diligent free-men to maintain them in order and comfort, a sight to justify the pride that its originator takes in it, a successful experiment, on a small scale, indeed, but arousing a wish for more.

And this is exactly what, not I only, but every landowner, every proprietor, every planter in the colony, would wish to see—namely, a greater abundance of villages and settlements like those just described, only to a wider purpose and on a larger scale. Certainly I have no desire to disparage the good qualities of the slave-descended black Creoles, or to join in the vague outcries, contradicted everywhere by facts, that ignorance, and still more prejudice, have raised against them. But this much must be allowed, that from the very circumstance of being slave-descended, they bear, and long will bear, traces of the deteriorating process to which they have been subjected in the persons of their ancestors, a deterioration not moral merely, but mental, and even physical. In fact, their rapid, though as yet only partial, recovery from this very degradation is one proof among many of the wonderful elasticity of the negro character. Hesiod, if I remember rightly, or, if not he, some other old coeval Greek, has said, “When Jupiter makes a man a slave he takes away half his brains from him;” and a truer thing was never said or sung. Cowardice, duplicity, dislike of labour, a habit of theft, sexual immorality, irreflectiveness, apathy—these are the seven daughters of slavery, and they but too often live persistently on, though their ill mother be dead for generations past. Hence the negro who has never been a slave, or who, at any rate, has never experienced that most crushing form of slavery, the organized task-mastership of a foreign and superior race, has a decided vantage ground, not only over his enslaved fellow-countrymen, but over the descendants of such, on whom his father’s sins, and still more the sins of his father’s masters, are by hereditary law visited even to the third and fourth generation.

Now assuming that of all races the negro is by physical constitution the best adapted to the South American tropics, and that negro labour is of all others, not the cheapest merely, but also the most

efficient in this soil—both of which are propositions that few experienced planters or overseers, will dispute—why not organize migration from Africa to the West Indies after a regular and durable fashion? and, as the East-African races are undoubtedly superior alike in mind and body to the Western, why not establish an emigration agency on the east coast—why not fix a locality at Zanzibar? Have we not lately closed in principle, and shall soon by means of our cruisers have closed in fact and deed, the East-African slave-trade, doing thereby a deed worthy of England, worthy of ourselves? True, and we look at our work and justly pronounce it to be “very good.” But what, if some of the immediate results of our work, in order to be rightly called “very good,” also require careful management, and the dexterity that not only destroys what is bad, but replaces it by something better? Have we not, while forbidding the further outpourings of the poison-stream that has for ages flowed in tears and blood from the ports of the East-African coast, driven back in a manner the bitter waters to eddy on themselves; and while stopping a recognised outlet of the unemployed and superabundant population, a wasteful and a wrongful one it is true, yet an outlet, created a novel surplus in the inland African labour market, where violence and captivity are the only laws of exchange and supply? Have we not also, while depriving Zanzibar of its hateful but long-established trade, the trade that alone gave it importance and wealth, curtailed the revenues, and with the revenues the very kingship of one whose patrons we had before consented to be, and whom we had ourselves taught to shelter his authority, nay, his very existence, under our flag?

Now so it is that of both the evils I have indicated, and neither of them are imaginary, a remedy is within easy reach, a remedy not only efficacious with regard to its immediate object, but beneficial in its ulterior results. “Easy reach,” did I say? Yes, easy enough if only well-meaning ignorance will stand aside, and have the grace to permit what it cannot comprehend. But this is a piece of good fortune to be wished for rather than hoped, and already I seem to hear a horrified outcry of “negro kidnapping,” “disguised slavery,” “slave-trade re-established,” and the rest, rising from every platform, and re-echoed from every bench of the Anti-Slavery Association and its kindred supporters. What! supply the deficit of West-Indian labour by negro importation from the East Coast! give the Seyyid, Sultan, or Sultanlet of Zanzibar, perhaps him of Muscat too, a nominal patronage and a real percentage of an emigration agency! load ships with African semi-slaves! bear them “far from home and all its pleasures,” to the coasts of Surinam, of Demerara, of St. Vincent, &c. ! what is all this but to revive the



monster we have ourselves so lately slain, to stultify our own wisdom, annul our own decree ?

Nothing of the kind ; say rather it is to hinder the brood that the monster has left from coming into life, to confirm the decree of self-maintaining freedom ; to complete what else if left imperfect might speedily bring in question the wisdom of our former deeds. It is to transfer, not by compulsion, but by their own free consent, those who, if they remain at home, cannot by the nature of things be other than slaves or slave-makers, to the conditions of honourable labour, self-support, and security ; to bring them into the full possession of whatever benefits organized society and equitable law can confer ; to substitute, so far as their own former masters are concerned, a fair and beneficial for an unjust and cruel gain ; to bestow on the lands of their destination advantages that no other means, no other colonists can equally secure.

It is certain that, if conducted under regulations and safeguards similar to those provided for the Coolie emigrants of Bengal and Madras, and with the same or analogous provisions in matters of engagement, voyage, and occupation, the unnecessary and burdensome obligation of a return passage being alone omitted, East African emigration would be much less costly, and at the same time much more profitable to the colonies, than Indian or Chinese. The negro is of himself a better agricultural labourer than the Hindoo ; he is stronger, healthier, more readily domiciled, more easily ruled, and, an important point, more likely to devote himself to field and country work after the expiration of his indentures. He is also much less disposed than either Coolie or Chinaman to swell the town population and the criminal list. I have said that in his case the option of a return passage might be safely omitted, for no negro, the solitary hero of Mrs. Hemans' ballad excepted, has any great longing to revisit his own natal land ; his country is not where he was born, but where he is well off ; no local worship, no sacred rivers, no ties of caste, draw him back to his first home. In him, therefore, is the best if not the only hope of supplementing the great, the urgent want of the New World, an indigenous population—for the Guiana Indian must unfortunately reckon for nothing, either in number or in available worth—and thus the benefit derived from him as an indentured labourer would be followed by the still more lasting benefit of an acclimatized and a useful colonist. And, to return to our friends of the Anti-Slavery Association, the evidence collected on all hands may surely have convinced the members of that respectable body, that Coolie emigration and Coolie labour in the West Indies are further removed from hardship, injustice, and slavery, than are too often the means by which our own agricultural labour-market is supplied, or the conditions by

which it is governed. Let them then rest assured that the same system would have no worse result for the East-African negro also.

Enough of this. The subject is one that cannot fail to be taken up sooner or later, not in speculative view, but in experimental practice; till then let it rest. Perhaps the time is not come yet; the very extent of the prospect suggests its distance. But, a little sooner, a little later, not the less surely it will be reached. An African colony, the Arab, has already half peopled the East; an African law, matured in Egypt, promulgated on the shores of the Red Sea, remodelled and re-promulgated in the deserts of the same coast, rules over half Asia this day. Already the Lybian Sibyl prepares to turn the next page of her book; its writing is the West. A new creation is wanted here; and creation of this sort is a work not for the European or his half-cousin the Hindoo, it belongs to the elder races. The Aryan of our day, the Indo-German, can elaborate, can perfect, he cannot originate; art-trained, art-exhausted, the productive energy of nature is his no longer. Unmodified by science, unpruned by art, the rough off-shoots of the over-teeming African stem are vital with the rude vitality of nature; like her they are prolific too.

Is it a dream? Possibly so; a nature-sent dream, as under the hot sun we float in breezeless calm down the glassy black waters between high walls of reed and forest, bright flowers, broad leaf, and over-topping palm up to the intense heaven all a-glow, till here before us on the left river-bank rise the bower-like avenues of Munnickendam. Here let us land, and from the study of the long-settled Creole negroes of this secluded estate let us draw, if so disposed, some augury as to what their brethren of the East-African coast, the colonists of our visionary or visioned future, are likely to be in and for South-American Surinam.

This at any rate is no dream. Two hundred and seventeen acres, two hundred and sixty labourers, all without exception negro-creole; average yearly produce, seven hundred and fifty hogsheads of sugar, besides molasses and rum; so much for Munnickendam statistics. Machinery of the older and simple sort; factory buildings corresponding; planter's dwelling-house large, old, and three-storied, Dutch in style, with high roof, and fantastic wolves topping the gables by way of weathercocks; a wide double flight of steps in front with a paved space, surrounded by an open parapet before the hall door; the garden very Dutch in its walks, flower-beds, and statues; long avenues, some of palmiste, some of areka palm, some of almond trees, with sago palms intermixed; around a green turfy soil, and a crescent background of cane-fields and forest; so much and enough, I think, for general description. Negroes very sturdy, very black, very plainly dressed, or half-dressed, in white and blue;

the women rejoicing in variegated turbans; children *à la* Cupid and Psyche as to costume, though not perhaps in feature or shape; three or four white men, overseers, straw-hatted, of course; lastly, for visitors, the Governor and his party, myself included; such are the principal accessories of the picture. Time, from five or so in the afternoon to midnight, or thereabouts; we did not very accurately consult our watches.

Night had fallen; but no—this is a phrase well enough adapted, it may be, to the night of the North, the heavy murky veil slowly let down fold after fold over the pale light that has done duty for days—here it is not so; transparent in its starry clearness, its stainless atmosphere, night rises as day had risen before, a goddess succeeding a goddess; not to blot out the fair world, but to enchase it in a black diamond circle in place of a white; to change enchantment for enchantment, the magic of shadow for the magic of light. But I am anticipating. A good hour before sunset the covered barge of the estate had set us ashore on the wharf, where, with flowers in their hands, songs on their lips, smiles on every face, and welcome in every gesture, the boys and girls of the place received us from the “stelling.” Between this double human range, that like an inner and more variegated avenue lined the over-arching trees from the water’s edge up to the dwelling-house, we passed along, while the merry tumult of the assembled crowd, and the repeated discharge of the small cannon planted at the landing place and in the garden mingled together to announce and greet our arrival. The warm although almost level sunbeams lit up the red brick lines of the central mansion, the tall tower-like factory chimneys, the statues in the garden, the pretty bush-embosomed cottages of the estate, and tipped with yellow gold the plummy cane-fields beyond. This lasted some time, till the sun set, and for a little while all was orderly and still in the quiet evening light.

But soon night had risen, and with her had risen the white moon, near her full, and now the merry-makers who had dispersed to their evening meal re-assembled on the gravel walks and clean-kept open spaces of the garden in front of the dwelling-house, to enjoy the sport of the hour; for in the West Indies as in Africa, in Surinam no less than at Damascus, the night is the negro’s own time; and no member of Parliament in the latter months of the session, no fashionable beauty in her fourth London season, can more persistently invert the solar allotment of the hours than does the negro votary of pleasure; and wherever and however pleasure be attainable, the negro is its votary.

Group by group, distinctly seen in the pale moonlight as if by day, only with an indistincter background, our Creole friends flocked on. The preparations for the dance were soon made. Drums, fifes, a

shrill violin, and a musical instrument some say of Indian, some say of negro invention, consisting of a notched gourd that when scraped by a small stick gives out a sound not unlike the chirping of a monster cricket, and accentuates time and measure after the fashion of triangles, were brought from Heaven knows what repositories, and with them the tuneful orchestra was complete. The dancers ranged themselves; more than a hundred men and women, mostly young, all dressed in their choicest for the night's sport. The men, with few exceptions, were attired in white trowsers and shirts of various colours, with a predominance of red; some dandies had wrapped gay sashes round their waists, and most had provided themselves with sprigs of flowers, jauntily stuck in their hatbands. The women's dresses consisted chiefly of loose white sacques, without the cumbrous under-layer of petticoats, or the other "troublesome disguises" that Europe conceals her beauties withal, and reserved their assortment of bright but rarely inharmonious colours for their fantastic turbans, some of which were arranged so as to give the effect of one or two moderate-sized horns projecting from the wearer's head, while other girls, with better taste, left an embroidered end hanging down on one side, Eastern fashion. Many of the women were handsome, shapely figures, full-limbed and full-bosomed; but—must I say it?—the particular charm of delicate feet and hands was universally wanting; nor indeed could it have been fairly looked for among a throng of field-labourers, female or male. As to faces, the peculiarities of the negro countenance are well known in caricature; but a truer pattern may be seen, by those who wish to study it, any day among the statues of the Egyptian rooms in the British Museum: the large gentle eye, the full but not over-protruding lips, the rounded contour, and the good-natured, easy, sensuous expression. This is the genuine African model; one not often, I am aware, to be met with in European or American thoroughfares, where the plastic African too readily acquires the careful look and even the irregularity of the features that surround him, but which is common enough in the villages and fields where he dwells after his own fashion, among his people, most common of all in the tranquil seclusion and congenial climate of a Surinam plantation. There you may find also a type neither Asiatic nor European, but distinctly African, with much of independence and vigour in the male physiognomy, and something that approaches, if it does not quite reach, beauty in the female. Rameses and his queen were cast in no other mould.<sup>1</sup>

The Governor and ourselves were seated with becoming dignity on

(1) I am glad that so keen and so discriminating an observer as the late Mr. Winwood Reade concurs with this very opinion; in support of which he cites the authority of Livingstone himself.—*Vide* "African Sketch-Book," vol. i. p. 108.

the wide open balcony atop of the steps leading up to the hall door, thus commanding a full view of the garden and the people assembled. Immediately in front of us was a large flower-bed, or rather a labyrinth of flower-beds, among which stood, like white goblins in the moonlight, the quaint statues before mentioned, methodically arranged after the most approved Dutch style, and flanked by two pieces of mimic artillery. Such was the centre-piece, and on either side there opened out a wide clear space, clean swept and strewn with "caddy," the usual white mixture of broken shell, coral, and sand, and in each of these spaces to right and left a band of musicians, or rather noise-makers, squatted negro-wise on the ground. Round these centres of attraction the crowd soon gathered in a double group, men and women, all noisy, animated, and ready for the dance. The moon, almost at the full, glittered bright overhead, and her uncertain light, while giving full effect to the half-barbaric picturesqueness of attire and form in the shifting eddy of white-clad figures, served also to veil from too exact view the defects—and they were many—in the clothes, ornaments, and appearance of the performers. Around the garden, and behind it, dark masses of palm, almond-tree, acacia, "saman," and kindred growths, rose against the sky, loftier and denser in seeming than by day. The whole formed an oval picture of brightness and life amid a dark and silent framework of shadow, a scene part gay, part impressive, and very tropical above all.

The music, or what did duty for such, began. At first it was of a European character, or rather travestied from European—disintegrated quadrilles and waltzes to no particular time. The negroes around, shy as they always are when in the presence of those whose criticisms they fear (for no race is more keenly sensitive in regard to ridicule than the African, except it be, perhaps, the semi-African Arab), did not at once venture to put forth all their prowess, and the performance opened with a few sporadic couples, women dancing with women, men poussetting to men, and either seeming half ashamed of their own audacity. But as the music continued and grew livelier, passing more and more from the imitation-European to the unfeigned African style of an unbroken monotonous drone with one ever-recurring cadence, a mere continuity of clanging sound, the dancers grew more animated. New couples, in which the proper interchange of sex was observed by the partners, formed themselves, till at last the larger group—that on our left—took up the genuine Ethiopian dance, well known in Oman, and witnessed by me there and elsewhere in the pleasant days, now long since gathered to the ineffectual past, when the East and I were one. A dance of life, where men ranged on one side and women on the other, advance, retreat, cross, join hands, break into whirling knots of twos and fours, separate, reform in line, to blend again into a seeming maze of orderly confusion—a whirl of very madness, yet with method in it—the intoxication of movement and

sound poured out in time and measure. He who has witnessed it, if there yet flow within his veins one drop of that primal savage blood without which manhood and womanhood too are not much better than mere titular names, cannot but yield himself up to the influence of the hour, cannot but drink of the bowl, join in the revel; and if any looker-on retains coolness enough to sneer or blame, why, let each follow his bent; but I for one had rather be on the side of David than of Michal, and the former had in the end, I think, the best of the jest and of the earnest too.

A Bacchanalian orgie, yet one in which Bacchus himself had no share; Venus alone presided, and sufficient for all beside; or, if Bacchus seemed present to her aid, it was not he, but Cupid in disguise. Half an hour, an hour the revelry continued, while the tumult grew every minute louder, and the dance more vehement, till, with an impulse simultaneous in its suddenness, the double chorus broke up, and blending in one confused mass, surrounded his Excellency the Governor, while, amid shouts, laughter, and huzzas, half a dozen sturdy blacks caught him up in their arms and bore him aloft in triumphal procession three times round the garden, while others gesticulated and pressed alongside, others danced before, all cheered, and we ourselves, aroused from our Africano-Oriental dream by the local significance of the act, hardly knew whether to laugh or to yield to the enthusiasm of the moment. That the Governor, though maintaining as far as possible an appearance of passive dignity and deprecatory acquiescence, heartily enjoyed the spontaneous tribute of affection and loyalty thus tumultuously expressed, I have no doubt, and so would you have enjoyed it, my dear reader, had it been offered you. Besides, he told me as much when, after a tremendous outburst of huzzas, his living throne gently dissolved asunder and allowed him footing on the ground again.

Then after a half-hour's pause, congratulations exchanged, healths drunk, and cordial merriment, in which all shared alike—performers, spectators, Europeans, negroes, and the rest—once more to the dance, but now in calmer measure and to a gentler tune. By this the moon, small and dazzling, rode high in the purple heavens, giving warning of midnight near, when, escorted down to the water's edge by those whose sports we had witnessed, and perhaps in part shared, we reluctantly threaded the dark shades of the avenue river-wards, and re-embarked on our little steamer, that had yet to bear us a mile farther along the current before we reached the night's lodging and rest prepared for us by the district magistrate, in his large and comfortable residence at Ephrata, so the place was named.

"I wished you to see something of our black Creoles as they are among themselves," said the Governor, as next morning we pursued our downward way to the river junction at the Sommelsdyk Fort, and thence turned off southward to explore the upper branch of the

Commeweyne, which we had on our way up passed by unvisited. Deep black, and much more rapid than the Cottica, its current flowed between noble forest scenes, alternating with cultivated spaces on either bank; but few large sugar estates came in view; plantains, cocoanuts, cassava, with cocoa-bushes intermixed, seemed the more favourite growths. The yearly amount of sugar manufactured in this district does not exceed one thousand hogsheads; the mills are all of the simplest kind, and moved by water-power. In general character, the scenery and water-side objects of the upper Commeweyne nearly resemble those of the upper Cottica, and have been sufficiently described before; a gradual diminution of underwood, an increase of height and girth in the forest trees, and a greater variety in them and in the flowering creepers that interlaced their boughs, being for many miles up country almost the only distinct indications of approach to the higher lands beyond, though the practised eye of a naturalist might doubtless detect many significant varieties in the insects or plants of the region.

And now, as we slowly stem the liquid glass, black as jet yet pure as crystal, of the strong-flowing Commeweyne, we remark (the Governor and I) the evident and recent increase in the number of small plantations, to the detriment—though a temporary one only, if events run their regular course—of the larger properties. This is a necessary phase of free labour, and through it the Surinam colony, like every other of like kind, must pass before it can reach the firm ground of self-sustaining prosperity. Till then, nothing is solid, nothing sure. Giant sugar estates—propped up or absolutely maintained by extraneous capital, and excluding or dwarfing into comparative nullity the varied parcel cultivation of local ownership and resources, are at best magnificent gambling speculations, most so when the price of their produce is not stored up, but at once applied to widening the enclosures, or purchasing some costly refinements of improved machinery. Establishments like these are every instant at the mercy of a sudden fluctuation of the market, of a new invention, of a tariff—in a word, they lie exposed to every accident of Fortune's caprice; and, capricious as she is throughout her whole domain, nowhere is the goddess more so than in the commercial province. Hence it follows that they who repine at the lengthening catalogue of five-acre and ten-acre lots—railing at their cultivators as idle pumpkin-eating squatters, and raising a desponding moan, occasionally an indignant howl, over the consequent withdrawal of labour from the five-hundred or thousand-acre estates—are not more reasonable in their complaints than he who should fall foul of the workmen employed in digging and laying the foundations of the house, and declare them to be lazy loons, and their labour valueless, because they do not at once bestow it on raising the second storey and furnishing the drawing-room.

In Dutch Guiana, taking Paramaribo, the capital, for its centre, we may regard the rest of the territory as made up, after a rough fashion, of three concentric circles. The circumference of the innermost one would, for what concerns the east and the districts we have now been visiting, pass through the confluence-point of the Commeweyne and Cottica Rivers at Sommelsdyk Fort; the second would intersect through the estate of La Paix on the upper Cottica, and the corresponding estate of Abendsrust on the upper Commeweyne; the external limits of the third would be correlative with those of the colonial frontier itself. Within the first circle, large estates, mostly owned by Europeans, or at any rate European Creoles, predominate. Throughout the second or intermediate circle, smaller properties, mostly in the hands of coloured or black Creoles, are more common. In the outermost space are the villages and provision grounds, few and far between, of the Bush-negroes, between whom and the European landholders the dark Creoles thus form a sort of link, social as well as territorial; or, to vary the phrase, a connecting medium, destined, if our conjectures be true, to become ultimately an absorbing one, not only of the more savage but of the more civilised element also.

But we are forgetting His Excellency. "In the labourers of Munnickendam," he continued, "you have a fair sample of our black Creoles; throughout the colony they are everywhere essentially the same. Fond enough, as you have seen, of pleasure and amusement, when they can get them; but when at work steady, sober, willing, and, what is a fortunate thing for all parties, without a trace of social or political restlessness in any direction. Their only fault is that there is not enough of them, and, what is worse, their numbers do not increase."

Why not? Unhealthy climate, some will say; while others, in concert with a late author, talk in bated breath of gross and ruinous vices, rendering it a question whether negroes should exist on the earth at all for a few generations longer; and others again find in infanticide a third and convenient solution of the question. Let us look a little closer.

And first, for the climate. Like British Guiana, its Dutch namesake is a low-lying plain, swampy in some places, forest-grown in others, and far within the tropics; none of them at first sight favourable conditions to salubrity of atmosphere. But where fresh sea-winds sweep over the earth day and night with scarce interrupted steadiness from year's end to year's end, an open plain is healthier by far than the sheltered valleys and picturesque nooks of a mountainous district; and among tidal streams on a tidal coast, the marsh-fevers, that render the moist shores of the stagnant Black Sea pool scarce less pestilential than those of Lagos itself, find little place. Tropical heat, though here it is never excessive, does not certainly in the long



run suit European residents; and at Surinam, where 79 F. is the yearly average—the highest ever recorded being 96 F. and the lowest 70—the climate must be admitted to be a warm one. On the other hand, those who have experience of Africa, the negro's birthplace, or have seen how much the black suffers in the comparatively moderate chill of winter-season in the northern West-Indian Islands, will hardly consider the heat of Dutch Guiana to be too great for the species that forms a good four-fifths of its population.

As to the second-named cause, or collection of causes rather, it is to be regretted that the author of "At Last" should, from ignorance, doubtless, or prejudice, have ever lent such vague and baseless calumnies the sanction of his respected name. Without being either a "clergyman," or even, though an official, a "police magistrate," I have knowledge enough of negro characters and ways to warrant me in asserting, and my readers in believing the assertion, that what is technically called vice is among Africans nearer allied to philoprogenitiveness than among, it may well be, most other races; and without attempting to excuse, much less, as some seem inclined to do, to vindicate the extreme laxity of their theory and practice in regard of connubial fidelity or maiden virtue, one must allow that their faults in these respects tend much more directly to the increase of the population than to its diminution. And, to have done once for all with a topic the mention of which, though unavoidable, is unpleasant, it may here be added that excess in alcoholic drink—a fault decidedly opposed, as all who have studied the subject know, to the "increase and multiply" of healthy Nature—is rare among the black Creoles of the Surinam capital, and rarer still, indeed almost unknown, among those of the country. So much for the second cause assigned.

A mere inspection of the yearly birth-rate, averaging thirty per thousand, disposes of the third allegation. Murdered children are not entered on parochial registers, nor do the numbers given leave much margin for kindred crimes at an earlier stage.

And yet the annual death-rate exceeds that of births by at least one per cent., as is stated, and this at the best of times. Some years show two per cent., or even higher. How is this? and if neither climate, nor vice, nor crime be the cause, where is it then to be sought?

But here let some indulgence be asked and given. We are on board a pleasure-boat, and our attention is being called away every moment, now to gaze on a "tall tree by the side of the river, one half of which was in flames," or rather flowers red as flames, and not less bright, "from the root to the top, and the other half green and in full leaf," that might have reminded Geraint and Enid of their Celtic wonderland; now to acknowledge the shouted welcome of bright figures crowding to some little landing-place on the way; now

by an opening vista of glittering plantain groves ; now by a tray full of glasses with appropriate contents circulating at frequent intervals round the deck. Amid interruptions like these it must be admitted that profound investigations, statistical columns, and a marshalled array of figures and facts, would be hardly less out of place than a sermon at a masked ball. But it is possible to say truth, and even serious truth, without sermonizing ; *ridentem dicere vera* and the rest. We will try.

All have heard, and all who have not merely heard but seen will attest, the fondness of negroes for children ; not their own children only, but any, white, brown, or black—for children generically taken, in a word. Demonstrative as is their affection, it is none the less genuine ; the feeling is instinctive, and the instinct itself is hardly ever absent from among them. I do not put it forward as a matter of praise, I mention it as a fact. If Sir S. Baker's sweeping assertion regarding I forget how many negro tribes, that they have among them no acknowledged form of worship of the Unknown, were exact, which it is not, the existence, the universality indeed, of baby-worship at any rate must be allowed, I think, even by that distinguished miso-African. Nor is this species of worship limited to the mothers of the babies, or to the womankind at large ; it is practised in the same degree by the men, who are not a whit behind the women in their love and care of children, especially the youngest.

But in the very fervour and ecstasy of her baby-worship, the negress-mother persists in worshipping her little divinity irreflectively, recklessly, and by a natural consequence often injuriously, sometimes destructively, to the baby-god itself. Heated from field-work, excited, over-done, she returns in the late afternoon to her cottage, and the first thing she does when arrived there is to catch up her little brown sprawler from the floor and put it to her breast. The result needs no guessing. Half an hour later she is howling as only a negress can howl over her offspring, convulsed or dead. Or perhaps, just as she was about to give, in more orderly fashion, the nourishment that the infant has been faintly waiting for some time past, a friend comes in to invite her to a dance or merry-making close by. Off she goes, having made Heaven knows what arrangements for the small creature's wants, or it may well be, in her eagerness for amusement, no arrangement at all ; purposes to come back in an hour, stays away until midnight, and, on her return home, finds another midnight, the midnight that knows no sunrise, closed over her child. And thus, and more. On over-feeding, injudicious feeding ; ailments misunderstood ; quack-doctoring—always preferred by the ignorant to all other ; on half-superstitious usages, not less injurious than silly ; on violent outbursts of passion—the passions of a negress, and

of a negro too, are at tropical heat, their rage absolute phrenzy—I need not dwell;—suppose what you will, you will be short of the mark. But cease to wonder if, among the most kindly-hearted, child-loving, and, I may add, child-producing race in the world, births, however numerous, are less in computation than deaths, if one-third, at least, by statistical registration—one full half, if to its records be added unregistered fact—of the negro children in Dutch Guiana die even before they are weaned. The causes, ninety-nine out of a hundred, are those which I have stated or alluded to, and no other.

What is, then, to be done? An evil, or rather an agglomeration of evils like these, that threaten to cut down the main-stem of the future, to dry up the very roots, to destroy the existence of the colony, must be put an end to, all will agree; but how?

There is a remedy, and a very simple one, tried before, and worth trying again. Let us go back in memory to the times when every individual negro life meant so many hundred florins to his owner, when the suppression of the “trade” had cut off the supply from without, and the birth of every slave-child on the estate brought a clear gain to the planter, just as its death represented an actual and heavy loss hard to replace, not to the parents only, but to the owner of parents and children too. Negroes and negresses might be never so unthinking then, never so reckless about what concerned themselves alone, but their master took good thought that they should not be careless where his own interest was involved. And in few things was it so closely involved, especially after the treaties of 1815 and 1819, as in the preservation of infant life among the labouring stock, and no precaution was neglected that could ensure this, and supplement the defects of maternal care. Many means were adopted; but the chiefest of all was the appointment on every estate of one or more of elderly women, appropriately styled “mammias,” chosen from among the negresses themselves, and whose sole duty was to watch each over a given number of infantile negroes, for whose proper care, nourishment, and good condition generally this foster-mother had to answer, and for whose loss, if they drooped and died, she was called to strict account. The history of slave institutions has been not inappropriately called the “devil’s book;” but here, at any rate, is a leaf of it worth taking out for insertion in a better volume.

Now fill up this outline project with the proper colouring of qualifications, provisos, regulations, and the remaining supplemental details of theory wrought out into fact, and you will have a scheme for the preservation of infant negro life, or rather the hindrance of its prodigal and ruinous waste, more likely to succeed in its object than any that I have yet heard or seen in practice. Then combine these, or similar measures, with a reasonable supply of the two needful things, without which neither Surinam nor any other Trans-

atlantic colony can prosper, or, indeed, exist—capital and immigration. Not the capital of official subsidy, but of private enterprise; nor the immigration of costly and burdensome East-Indian Coolies, or the yet costlier and yet more troublesome Chinese, but of vigorous, healthy, willing East Africans, the ex-slaves of the Zanzibar and Oman markets. Then put these three requisites together, and stand up and prophesy to Dutch Guiana what golden-aged future you will; nor fear being numbered, in the latter days, among the false prophets—your place will be with the true.

The sea-ebb has set the dammed-up waters of the Commeweyne at liberty to follow their natural bent, and we float swiftly down the stream, admiring, commenting, and enjoying, now the ever-varying, ever-recurring scenes of life and labour of tropical nature and European energy, of forest, plantation, mansion, cottage, and field that every river bend unfolds; now the “feast of reason and the flow of soul”—a very hackneyed phrase—as we go; and now more substantial feastings, and the flow of various compositions, very congenial to the Dutch soul and body too, nor less to the English. But the distance was considerable, and night looked down on us with its thousand starry eyes long before we reached Fort Amsterdam and the broad Surinam waters. An hour later we disembarked at the Government stelling of the silent capital, well pleased with our river-excursion and with each other.

Not many days after I was riding out with the Governor on the high-road—that is to say, on the horse-path, for the true high-road here, as elsewhere in Guiana, is by water—leading towards the wooded regions of Para, south-west of Paramaribo, to which, in composition with some other Indian word, it has given its name. Its inhabitants are reckoned, exclusive of Bush-negroes, at nearly five thousand; they live in villages, and occupy themselves to some extent in sugar cultivation, but generally in small lots, where grow cocoa, coffee, and plantains; indigo and tobacco are also among the products of the land. The ground is well raised above the water-level—to the south, indeed, it becomes hilly; the forest scenery is said to surpass in beauty, as in extent, that of any other district in the colony. “You can ride for seven days in one direction without ever getting out of the shade,” said the Governor, as I noticed the noble outskirts of the woods before us; and he urged on me, almost as a duty, a visit to Para, where, amid the small Creole proprietors and the forest-embowered villages, he assured me I should see Surinam negro life to better advantage, witness greater comfort and contentment, act spectator, or sharer, if the fancy took, of gayer festivities than even on the banks of the Cottica and at Munnickendam. But my hank of Surinam thread was too nearly spun out already, and the colours of other lands were now about to take its place in the fate-woven twine.

W. G. PALGRAVE.

## ON SPELLING.

THE remarks which I venture to offer in these pages on the corrupt state of the present spelling of English, and on the advantages and disadvantages connected with a reform of English orthography, were written in fulfilment of a promise of very long standing. Ever since the publication of the Second Volume of my Lectures on the Science of Language in 1863, where I had expressed my sincere admiration for the courage and perseverance with which Mr. Isaac Pitman and some of his friends, particularly Mr. A. J. Ellis, for six years his most active associate, had fought the battle of a reform in English spelling, Mr. Pitman had been requesting me to state more explicitly than I had done in my Lectures my general approval of his life-long endeavours. He wished more particularly that I should explain why I, though by profession an etymologist, was not frightened by the spectre of phonetic spelling, while such high authorities as Archbishop Trench and Dean Alford had declared that phonetic spelling would necessarily destroy the historical and etymological character of the English language.

If I ask myself why I put off the fulfilment of my promise from year to year, the principal reason I find is, that really I had nothing more to say than what, though in few words, I had said before. Everything that can be said on this subject has been said and well said, not only by Mr. Pitman, but by a host of writers and lecturers, among whom I might mention Mr. Alexander J. Ellis, Dr. Latham, Professors Haldeman, Whitney, and Hadloy, Mr. Withers, Mr. E. Jones, Dr. J. H. Gladstone, and many others. The whole matter is no longer a matter for argument; and the older I grow, the more I feel convinced that nothing vexes people so much, and hardens them in their unbelief and in their dogged resistance to reforms, as undeniable facts and unanswerable arguments. Reforms are carried by Time, and what generally prevails in the end, are not logical deductions, but some haphazard and frequently irrational motives. I do not say, therefore, with Dean Swift, that "there is a degree of corruption wherewith some nations, as bad as the world is, will proceed to an amendment; till which time particular men should be quiet." On the contrary, I feel convinced that practical reformers, like Mr. Pitman, should never slumber nor sleep. They should keep their grievances before the public in season and out of season. They should have their lamps burning, to be ready whenever the right time comes. They should repeat the same thing over and over again, undismayed by indifference, ridicule, contempt, and all the other weapons which the lazy world knows so well how to employ against those who venture to disturb its peace. I myself, however, am not a practical reformer; least of all in a matter which concerns Englishmen only—viz., the spelling of the English language. I

should much rather, therefore, have left the fight to others, content with being merely a looker on. But when I was on the point of leaving England my conscience smote me. Though I had not actually given a pledge, I remembered how again and again I had said to Mr. Pitman that I would much rather keep than make a promise; and though overwhelmed with other work at the time, I felt that before my departure I ought, if possible, to satisfy Mr. Pitman's demands. The article was written; and though my own plans have since been changed, and I remain at Oxford, it may as well be published in discharge of a debt which has been for some time heavy on my conscience.

What I wish most strongly to impress on my readers is that I do not write as an advocate. I am not an agitator for phonetic reform in England. My interest in the matter is, and always has been, purely theoretical and scientific. Spelling and the reform of spelling are problems which concern every student of the science of language. It does not matter whether the language be English, German, or Dutch. In every written language the problem of reforming its antiquated spelling must sooner or later arise; and we must form some clear notion whether anything can be done to remove or alleviate a complaint inherent in the very life of language. If my friends tell me that the idea of a reform of spelling is entirely Quixotic, that it is a mere waste of time to try to influence a whole nation to surrender its historical orthography and to write phonetically, I bow to their superior wisdom as men of the world. But as I am not a man of the world, but rather an observer of the world, my interest in the subject, my convictions as to what is right and wrong, remain just the same. It is the duty of scholars and philosophers not to shrink from holding and expressing what men of the world call Quixotic opinions; for, if I read the history of the world rightly, the victory of reason over unreason, and the whole progress of our race, have generally been achieved by such fools as ourselves—"rushing in where angels fear to tread," till after a time the track becomes beaten, and even angels are no longer afraid. I hold, and have confessed much more Quixotic theories on language than this belief, that what has been done before by Spaniards and Dutchmen—what is at this very moment being done by Germans, viz., to reform their corrupt spelling—may be achieved even by Englishmen and Americans.

I have expressed my belief that the time will come when not only the various alphabets and systems of spelling, but many of the languages themselves which are now spoken in Europe, to say nothing of the rest of the world, will have to be improved away from the face of the earth and abolished. Knowing that nothing rouses the ire of a Welshman or a Gael so much as to assert the expediency, nay, necessity, of suppressing the teaching of their languages at school, it seems madness to hint that it would be a blessing to every child born in Holland, in Portugal, or in Denmark—nay, in Sweden and even

in Russia—if, instead of learning a language which is for life a barrier between them and the rest of mankind, they were at once to learn one of the great historical languages which confer intellectual and social fellowship with the whole world. If, as a first step in the right direction, four languages only, viz., English, French, German, Italian (or, possibly, Spanish), were taught at school, the saving of time—and what is more precious than time?—would be infinitely greater than what has been effected by railways and telegraphs. But I know that no name in any of the doomed languages would be too strong to stigmatise such folly. We should be told that a Japanese only could conceive such an idea; that for a people deliberately to give up its language was a thing never heard of before; that a nation would cease to be a nation if it changed its language; that it would, in fact, commit “the happy dispatch,” *à la Japonaise*. All this may be true, but I still hold that language is meant as an instrument of communication, and that, in the struggle for life, the most efficient instrument of communication must certainly carry the day, as long as natural selection, or, as we formerly called it, reason, rules the world.

To return, however, to the problem, to the solution of which Mr. Pitman has devoted the whole of his active life, let me say again that my interest in it is purely philological; or, if you like, historical. The problem which has to be solved in England is not a new one, nor an isolated one. It occurs again and again in the history of every language; in fact, it must occur. When languages are reduced to writing, they are at first written phonetically, though always in a very rough and ready manner. One dialect, that of the dominant, the literary or priestly, class, is generally selected; and the spelling, once adopted, becomes in a very short time traditional and authoritative. What took place thousands of years ago, we can see taking place, if we like, at the present moment. A missionary in the island of Mangaia, the Rev. W. Gill, first introduced the art of writing among his converts. He learnt their language, at least one dialect of it, he translated part of the Bible into it, and adopted, of necessity, a phonetic spelling. That dialect is gradually becoming the recognised literary language of the whole island, and his spelling is taught at school. Other dialects, however, continue to be spoken, and they may in time influence the literary dialect. For the present, however, the missionary dialect, as it is called by the natives themselves, and the missionary spelling, rule supreme, and it will be some time before a spelling reform is wanted out there.

Among the more ancient nations of Europe, not only does the pronunciation of a language maintain its inherent dialectic variety, and fluctuate through the prevalence of provincial speakers, but the whole body of a language changes, while yet the spelling, once adopted in public documents, and taught to children, remains for a long time the same. In early times, when literature was in its infancy, when copies of books could easily be counted, and when the

*norma scribendi* was in the hands of a few persons, the difficulty of adapting the writing to the ever varying pronunciation of a language was comparatively small. We see it when we compare the Latin of early Roman inscriptions with the Latin of Cicero. We know from Cicero himself that when he settled among the patricians of Rome, he had on some small points to change both his pronunciation and his spelling of Latin. The reform of spelling was a favourite subject with Roman scholars, and even emperors were not too proud to dabble in inventing new letters and diacritical signs. The difficulty, however, never assumed serious proportions. The small minority of people who were able to read and write pleased themselves as best they could, and, by timely concessions, prevented a complete estrangement between the written and the spoken language.

Then came the time when Latin ceased to be Latin, and the vulgar dialects, such as Italian, French, and Spanish, took its place. At that time the spelling was again phonetic, though here and there tinged by reminiscences of Latin spelling. There was much variety, but considering how limited the literary intercourse must have been between different parts of France, Spain, or Italy, it is surprising that on the whole there should have been so much uniformity in the spelling of these modern dialects. A certain local and individual freedom of spelling, however, was retained; and we can easily detect in mediæval MSS. the spelling of literate and illiterate writers, the hand of the learned cleric, the professional clerk, and the layman.

The great event which forms a decisive epoch in the history of spelling is the introduction of printing. With printed books, and particularly with printed bibles, scattered over the country, the spelling of words became rigid and universally binding. Some languages, such as Italian, were more fortunate than others in having a more rational system of spelling to start with. Some, again, like German, were able to make timely concessions, while others, such as Spanish, Dutch, and French, had Academies to help them at critical periods of their history. The most unfortunate in all these respects was English. It started with a Latin alphabet, the pronunciation of which was unsettled, and which had to be applied to a Teutonic language. After this first phonetic compromise it had to pass through a confused system of spelling, half Saxon, half Norman; half phonetic, half traditional. The history of the spelling, and even of the pronunciation, of English, in its passage from Anglo-Saxon to middle and modern English, has lately been studied with great success by Mr. Ellis and Mr. Sweet. I must refer to their books, "*On Early English Pronunciation*," and "*On the History of English Sounds*," which contain a wealth of illustration almost bewildering. And even after English reaches the period of printing, the confusion is by no means terminated; on the contrary, for a time it is greater than ever.<sup>1</sup> How this came to pass has been

(1) The pronoun *it* was spelt in eight different ways by Tyndale, thus, *hyt*, *hytt*, *hit*,  
VOL. XIX. N.S. P P



well illustrated by Mr. Marsh in his excellent "Lectures on the English Language," p. 687; *seq.* What we now call the established system of English orthography may, in the main, be traced back to Johnson's Dictionary, and to the still more capricious sway exercised by large printing-offices and publishers. It is true that the evil of printing carried to a certain extent its own remedy. If the spelling became unchangeable, the language itself, too, was, by means of a printed literature, checked considerably in its natural growth and its dialectic variety. Nevertheless English has changed since the invention of printing; English is changing, though by imperceptible degrees, even now; and if we compare English as spoken with English as written, they seem almost like two different languages; as different as Latin is from Italian.

This, no doubt, is a national misfortune, but it is inevitable. Little as we perceive it, language is, and always must be, in a state of fermentation; and whether within hundreds or within thousands of years, all living languages must be prepared to encounter the difficulty which in England stares us in the face at present. "What shall we do?" ask our friends. There is our whole national literature, they say; our libraries actually bursting with books and newspapers. Are all these to be thrown away? Are all valuable books to be reprinted? Are we ourselves to unlearn what we have learnt with so much trouble, and what we have taught to our children with greater trouble still? Are we to sacrifice all that is historical in our language, and sink down to the low level of the *Phonetic Nuz*? I could go on multiplying these questions till even those men of the world who now have only a shrug of the shoulder for the reformers of spelling, should say, "We had no idea how strong our position really is."

But with all that, the problem remains unsolved. What are people to do when language and pronunciation change, while their spelling is declared to be unchangeable? It is, I believe, hardly necessary that I should prove how corrupt, effete, and utterly irrational the present system of spelling is, for no one seems inclined to deny all that. I shall only quote, therefore, the judgment of one man, the late Bishop Thirlwall, a man who never used exaggerated language. "I look," he says, "upon the established system, if an accidental custom may be so called, as a mass of anomalies, the growth of ignorance and chance, equally repugnant to good taste and to common sense. But I am aware that the public cling to these anomalies with a tenacity proportioned to their absurdity, and are jealous of all encroachment on ground consecrated by prescription to the free play of blind caprice."

*hitt, it, itt, yt, ytt.* Another author spelt *tongue* in the following ways: *tung, tong, tungs, tongue, tounge*. The word *head* was variously spelt *hed, heede, hede, hefede*. The spellings *obay, survey, pray, vail, vain*, are often used for *obey, survey, prey, veil, vein*. *On* and *oio* are used indifferently.

It may be useful, however, to quote the testimonials of practical men in order to show that this system of spelling has really become one of the greatest national misfortunes, swallowing up millions of money every year, and blighting all attempts at national education. Mr. Edward Jones, a schoolmaster of great experience, having then the superintendence of the Hibernian Schools, Liverpool, wrote in the year 1868:—

“The Government has for the last twenty years taken education under its care. They divided the subjects of instruction into six grades. The highest point that was attempted in the Government schools was that a pupil should be able to read with tolerable ease and expression a passage from a newspaper, and to spell the same with a tolerable amount of accuracy.”

Let us look at the results as they appear in the report of the Committee of Council on Education for 1870-71:—

Schools or Departments under separate head teachers in England and Wales inspected during the year ending August 31, 1870 . . . . .	15,287
Certificated, assistant, and pupil teachers employed in these schools . . . . .	28,033
Scholars in daily average attendance throughout the year . . . . .	1,168,981
Scholars present on the day of inspection . . . . .	1,473,883
Scholars presented for examination:—	
Under ten years of age . . . . .	473,444
Over ten years of age . . . . .	292,144
	<hr/>
	765,588
Scholars presented for Standard VI.:—	
Under ten years of age . . . . .	227
Over ten years of age . . . . .	32,953
	<hr/>
	33,180
Scholars who passed in Standard VI.:—	
1. Reading a short paragraph from a newspaper . . . . .	30,985
2. Writing the same from dictation . . . . .	27,989
3. Arithmetic . . . . .	22,839

Therefore, less than one scholar for each teacher, and less than two scholars for each school inspected, reached Standard VI.

In 1873 the state of things, according to the official returns of the Education Department, was much the same. First of all, there ought to have been at school 4,600,000 children between the ages of three and thirteen. The number of children on the register of inspected schools was 2,218,598. Out of that number, about 200,000 leave school annually, their education being supposed to be finished. Out of these 200,000, ninety per cent. leave without reaching the 6th Standard, eighty per cent. without reaching the 5th, and sixty per cent. without reaching the 4th Standard.

The report for 1874-75 shows an increase of children on the books, but the proportion of children passing in the various standards is substantially the same. (See “Popular Education,” by E. Jones, B.A., an ex-schoolmaster, 1875.) It is calculated that for such results as

these the country, whether by taxation or by voluntary contributions, pays annually nearly £3,500,000.

According to the same authority, Mr. E. Jones, it now takes from six to seven years to learn the arts of reading and spelling with a fair degree of intelligence—i.e., about 2,000 hours; and to many minds the difficulties of orthography are insurmountable. The bulk of the children pass through the Government schools without having acquired the ability to read with ease and intelligence.

After a careful examination of young men and women from thirteen to twenty years of age in the factories of Birmingham, it was proved that only four and a half per cent. were able to read a simple sentence from an ordinary school-book with intelligence and accuracy.

This applies to the lower classes. But with regard to the higher classes the case seems almost worse; for Dr. Morell, in his "Manual of Spelling," asserts that out of 1,972 failures in the Civil Service examinations, 1,866 candidates were plucked for spelling.

So much for the pupils. Among the teachers themselves it was found in America that out of one hundred common words, the best speller among the eighty or ninety teachers examined failed in one, some prize-takers failed in four or five, and some others missed over forty. The Deputy State Superintendent declared that on an average the teachers of the State would fail in spelling to the extent of twenty-five per cent.

What, however, is even more serious than all this is, not the great waste of time in learning to read, and the almost complete failure in national education, but the actual mischief done by subjecting young minds to the illogical and tedious drudgery of learning to read English as spelt at present. Everything they have to learn in reading (or pronunciation) and spelling is irrational; one rule contradicts the other, and each statement has to be accepted simply on authority, and with a complete disregard of all those rational instincts which lie dormant in the child, and ought to be awakened by every kind of healthy exercise.

I know there are persons who can defend anything, and who hold that it is due to this very discipline that the English character is what it is: that it retains respect for authority; that it does not require a reason for everything; and that it does not admit that what is inconceivable is therefore impossible. Even English orthodoxy has been traced back to that hidden source, because a child accustomed to believe that t, h, o, u, g, h, is *though*, and that t, h, r, o, u, g, h, is *through*, would afterwards believe anything. It may be so; still I doubt whether even such objects would justify such means. Lord Lytton says, "A more lying, round-about, puzzle-headed delusion than that by which we confuse the clear instincts of truth in our accursed system of spelling was never concocted by the father of falsehood. . . . How can a system of education flourish that begins by so monstrous a falsehood, which the sense of hearing suffices to contradict?"

The question, then, that will have to be answered sooner or

later is this :—Can this unsystematic system of spelling English be allowed to go on for ever? Is every English child, as compared with other children, to be mulcted in two or three years of his life in order to learn it? Are the lower classes to go through school without learning to read and write their own language intelligently? And is the country to pay millions every year for this utter failure of national education? I do not believe that such a state of things will be allowed to continue for ever, particularly as a remedy is at hand—a remedy that has now been tested for twenty or thirty years, and that has answered extremely well. I mean Mr. Pitman's system of phonetic writing, as applied to English.

I give his alphabet, which comprehends the thirty-eight broad typical sounds of the English language, and assigns to each a definite sign. With these thirty-eight signs, English can be written rationally and read easily; and, what is most important, it has been proved by an experience of many years, by numerous publications, and by practical experiments in teaching both children and adults, that such a system as Mr. Pitman's is perfectly practical.

#### THE PHONETIC ALPHABET.

The phonetic letters in the first column are pronounced like the italic letters in the words that follow. The last column contains the names of the letters.

##### CONSONANTS.

###### *Mutes.*

P	p	rope.....pi
B	b	rob <i>c</i> .....bi
T	t	fate .....ti
D	d	fade.....di
C	ç	ctch .....çe
J	j	ed <i>g</i> e .....je
K	k	leek.....ke
G	g	leag <i>ue</i> ....ge

###### *Continuants.*

F	f	saf <i>e</i> .....ef
V	v	save.....vi
H	h	wreath...if
Ä	ä	wreath <i>c</i> ..di
S	s	hiss.....es
Z	z	his.....zi
Σ	ʃ	vicious...if
Ξ	ʒ	vision...ʒi

###### *Nasals.*

M	m	seem....em
N	n	se <i>en</i> .....en
W	ŋ	sing.....iŋ

**DIPHTHONGS:** *Æ* i,  
as heard in by.

###### *Liquids.*

L	l	fall.....el
R	r	rare.....ar

###### *Coalescents.*

W	w	wet.....we
Y	y	yet.....ye

###### *Aspirate.*

H	h	hay.....eç
---	---	------------

##### VOWELS.

A	a	am.....at
Ä	ä	alms.....s
E	e	ell.....et
Æ	æ	ale.....æ
I	i	ill.....it
Ü	ü	eel.....i
O	o	on.....ot
Ö	ö	all.....ö
Ø	ø	up.....st
Ö	ø	ope.....ö
U	u	full.....ut
W	u	food.....u

*U* u, OU ou, OI oi.  
new, now, boy.

## SPECIMEN OF PHONETIC PRINTING.

Ov let yirz de høl sꝛbjekt ov Fonetiks haz bin tēken ɛp wið in-krist ardor bi sientifik men, and asolts hav bin mēd [ɛpon ðe komon "efit and kɔrsɛpt spelij"] bi fri diferent armiz, filolojists, fiziolojists, and maðematifanz.

Ƴ ot not tu ɔmit hir tu menʃon ðe valꝛabel servisez renderd bi ðɔz hu, for nirli twenti yirz, hav bin leborij in Ingland tu tsɛrn ðe rezɛlts ov sientifik reserɛɟ tu praktikal ʊs, in ðevizij and propagetiŋ a nꝛ sistem ov "Brif Ritiŋ and tru Speliŋ," best nɔn ɛnder ðe nem ov ðe *Fonetik Reform*. Ƴ am far from ɛnderretiŋ ðe difikɛltiz ðat stand in ðe we ov sɛɟ a reform, and i am not sɔ sangwin az tu indɛlj in eni hɔps ov siij it karid for ðe nekst fri or fɔr jenereʃonz. Bɛt i fil konvinst ov ðe truuf and rizonabelnes ov ðe prinsipelz on whiɟ ðat reform resta, and az ðe innēt regard for truuf and rizon, houeɛr dormant or timid at tɛmz, haz olwez pruuɛd irrezistibel in ðe end, enebliŋ men tu part wið ol ðe hɔld mɔst ðir and sekred, wheder korn lɔz, or Stuart ðijnastiz, or pepal leɟets, or hiðen iðolz, i dout not ðat ðe efite and kɔrsɛpt ɔrtografi wil folɔ in ðer tsɛrn. Neʃonz hav befor nou ɟenjd ðer nꝛmerikal figuɛz, ðer leterz, ðer kronoloji, ðer wets and mezuɛz; and ðɔ Mr Pitman mɛ not liv tu si ðe rezɛlts ov hiz perseɛriŋ and disinterested ekzerʃonz, it rekwiɛɛ nɔ profetik pouer tu persiv ðat whot at prezent iz puu-puud bi ðe meni, wil mek its we in ðe end, ɛnles met bi arguments stronger ðan ðɔz hiðertu leɛeld at ðe *Fonetik Nɛz*. Wɛn argument whiɟ miɛt bi sɛpɛzd tu we wið ðe stꝛdent ov langwej, nemli, ðe obskureʃon ov ðe etimolojikāl strɛktuɛ ov wɛɛɛdz, i kanot konsider veri formidabel. ðe prɔnɛnsiɛʃon ov langwejez ɟenjez akordiŋ tu fikst lɔz, ðe spelij iz ɟenjd in ðe mɔst arbitrari maner, sɔ ðat if our spelij folɛd ðe prɔnɛnsiɛʃon ov wɛɛɛdz, it wud in rialiti bi a greter help tu ðe kritikal stꝛdent ov langwej ðan ðe prezent ɛnserten and ɛnsientifik mɛd ov ritiŋ.—*Maks Myler's Sekond Siriz ov "Lektuɛɛz on ðe Sjens ov Langwej," deliverd at ðe Roial Institꝛʃon, Lɛndon, 1863.*

Now I ask any intelligent reader who does not think that everything new and strange is, *ipso facto*, ridiculous and absurd, whether, after a few days' practice, he or she would not read and write English, according to Mr. Pitman's system, with perfect ease? Of course it takes more than five minutes to master it, and more than five minutes to form an opinion of its merits. But admitting even that people of a certain age should find this new alphabet troublesome, we must not forget that no reform can be carried without a generation or two of martyrs; and what true reformers have to think of is not themselves, but those who come after them—those, in fact, who are now growing up to inherit hereafter, whether they like it or not, all the good and all the evil which we choose to leave to them.

It might be said, however, that Mr. Pitman's system, being entirely phonetic, is too radical a reform, and that many and the worst irregularities in English spelling could be removed without

going quite so far. The principle that half a loaf is better than no bread is not without some truth, and in many cases we know that a policy of compromise has been productive of very good results. But, on the other hand, this half-hearted policy has often retarded a real and complete reform of existing abuses; and in the case of a reform of spelling, I almost doubt whether the difficulties inherent in half measures are not as great as the difficulties of carrying a complete reform. If the world is not ready for reform, let us wait. It seems far better, and at all events far more honest, to wait till it is ready than to carry the reluctant world with you a little way, and then to find that all the impulsive force is spent, and the greater part of the abuses established on firmer ground than ever.

Mr. Jones,<sup>1</sup> who represents the conciliatory reformers of spelling, would be satisfied with a moderate scheme of spelling reform, in which, by observing analogy and following precedent in altering a comparatively small number of words, it would be possible to simplify orthography to a considerable extent without applying any new principle, or introducing new letters, and yet to reduce the time and labour in teaching reading and spelling by at least one-half. It might at all events be possible to settle the spelling of those two to three thousand words which at present are spelt differently by different authorities. This scheme, advocated by Mr. Jones, is certainly very clever; and if it had a chance of success, I myself should consider it a great step in advance. My only doubt is whether, in a case like this, a small measure of reform would be carried more easily than a complete reform. It is different in German, where the disease has not spread so far. Here the committee appointed by Government to consider the question of a reform of spelling has declared in favour of some such moderate principles as Mr. Jones advocates for English. In English, however, the difficulty lies in changing anything; and if the principle of any change is once admitted, it would really be easier, I believe, to begin *de novo* than to change something, and leave the rest unchanged.

Let us now see how Mr. Pitman's or any similar system of phonetic writing has worked where it has been put to the test.

Mr. Wm. White writes:—"I speak from experience. I have taught poor children in Glasgow to read the Sermon on the Mount after a course of exercises extending over no more than six hours."

The following is an extract from a letter written some time ago by the late Mr. Wm. Colbourne, manager of the Dorset Bank at Stourminster, to a friend of his, a schoolmaster. He says:—

"My little Sidney, who is now a few months more than four years old, will read any phonetic book without the slightest hesitation; the hardest names or the longest words in the Old or New Testament form no obstacle to him: And how long do you think it took me—for I am his teacher—to impart to

(1) "Popular Education. A Revision of English Spelling a National Necessity." By E. Jones, B.A. • London, 1876.

him this power? Why, something less than eight hours! You may believe it or not as you like, but I am confident that not more than that amount of time was spent on him, and that was in snatches of five minutes at a time, while tea was getting ready. I know you will be inclined to say, 'All that is very well, but what is the use of reading phonetic books? he is still as far off, and may be farther, from reading romanic books.' But in this you are mistaken. Take another example. His next elder brother, a boy of six years, has had a phonetic education so far. What is the consequence? Why, reading in the first stage was so delightful and easy a thing to him, that he taught himself to read romanically, and it would be a difficult matter to find one boy in twenty, of a corresponding age, that could read half so well as he can in any book. Again, my oldest boy has written more phonetic shorthand and long-hand, perhaps, than any boy of his age (eleven years) in the kingdom; and no one I daresay has had less to do with that absurdity of absurdities, the spelling-book! He is now at a first-rate school in Wiltshire, and in the half-year preceding Christmas, he carried off the prize for orthography in a contest with boys some of them his seniors by years!"

Mr. A. J. Ellis, than whom no one has laboured more devotedly for a reform of spelling, as a first step in a reform of national education, and who has himself elaborated several most ingenious systems of phonetic writing, gives us the following as the results of his practical experience:—

"Careful experiments in teaching children of various ages and ranks, and even paupers and criminal adults, have established—

"1. That pupils may be taught to read books in phonetic print, slowly but surely, in from ten to forty hours, and will attain considerable fluency after a few weeks' practice.

"2. That when the pupils have attained fluency in reading from phonetic print, a very few hours suffice to give them the same fluency in reading ordinary print.

"3. That the whole time necessary for imparting a knowledge of both phonetic and ordinary reading does not exceed eight months for children of average intelligence, between four and five years of age, taught in class, at school, not more than half an hour to an hour each day; and that in this time an ability to read is acquired superior to that usually attained in two or three times the period on the old plan; while the pronunciation of the pupil is much improved, his interest in his study is kept alive, and a logical training of enduring value is given to his mind by the habitual analysis and synthesis of spoken sounds.

"4. That those taught to read in this manner acquire the art of ordinary spelling more readily than those instructed on the old method."

There remains, therefore, this one objection only, that whatever the practical and whatever the theoretical advantages of the phonetic system may be, it would utterly destroy the historical or etymological character of the English language.

Suppose it did; what then? The Reformation is supposed to have destroyed the historical character of the English Church, and that sentimental grievance is still felt by some students of ecclesiastical antiquities. But did England, did all the really progressive nations of Europe allow this sentimental grievance to outweigh the practical and theoretical advantages of Protestant Reform? Language is not made for scholars and etymologists; and if the whole race of English etymologists were really to be swept away by the introduction of a spelling reform, I hope they would be the first to rejoice in sacrificing themselves in so good a cause.

But is it really the case that the historical continuity of the English language would be broken by the adoption of phonetic spelling, and that the profession of the etymologist would be gone for ever? I say, No, most emphatically, to both propositions. If the science of language has proved anything, it has proved that all languages change according to law, and with considerable uniformity. If, therefore, the writing followed, *pari passu*, on the changes in pronunciation, what is called the etymological consciousness of the speakers and the readers—I speak, of course, of educated people only—would not suffer in the least. If we retain the feeling of an etymological connection between *gentlemanly* and *gentlemanlike*, we should surely retain it whether we write *gentlemanly* or *gentlemanli*. If we feel that *think* and *thought*, *bring* and *brought*, *buy* and *bought*, *freight* and *fraught*, belong together, should we feel it less if we wrote *thot*, *bröt*, *böt*, *frot*? If, in speaking, those who know Latin retain the feeling that words ending in *ation* correspond to Latin words in *atio*, would they lose the feeling if they saw the same words spelt with “*eson*”? or even *esn*? Do they not recognise Latin *itia* in *-ice*; or *ilis* in *le*, as in *-able*? If the scholar knows, at once, that such words as *barbarous*, *anxious*, *circus*, *genius*, are of Latin origin, would he hesitate if the last syllable in all of them were uniformly written “*xs*”? Nay, is not the present spelling of *barbarous* and *anxious* entirely misleading, by confounding words ending in *-osus*, such as *famous* (*famosus*) with words ending in *-us*, like *barbarous*, *anxious*, &c.? Because the Italians write *filosofo*, are they less aware than the English, who write *philosopher*, and the French, who write *philosophe*, that they have before them the Latin *philosophus*, the Greek *φιλόσοφος*? If we write *f* in *fancy*, why not in *phantom*? if in *frenzy* and *frantic*, why not in *phrenology*? A language which tolerates *vial* for *phial*, need not shiver at *filosofer*. Every educated speaker knows that such words as *honour*, *ardour*, *colour*, *odour*, *labour*, *vigour*, *error*, *emperor*, have passed from Latin to French, and from French to English. Would he know it less if all were spelt alike, such as *honor* (*honorable*), *ardor*, *vigor* (*rigorous*), *labor* (*laborious*) or even “*onsr*, *ardsr*, *vigr*? The old spelling of *emperor*, *doctor*, *governor*, and *error*, was *emperour*, *doctour*, *governour*, and *errour*. If these could be changed, why not the rest? Spenser has *neibor* for *neighbour*, and it is difficult to say what was gained by changing *-bor* into *-bour* in such purely Saxon words as *neighbour*, *harbour*. No doubt if we see *laugh* written with *gh* at the end, those who know German are at once reminded of its etymological connection with the German *lachen*; but we should soon know the same by analogy, if we found not only “*lsf*,” but “*kof*” for *cough* (G. *keuchen*), “*ensf*” for *enough* (G. *genug*), &c. In “*drstf*,” phonetic spelling has nearly supplanted the so-called historical spelling *draught*; in “*dwarf*” (*dwergh*, *thueorh*) and in “*rsf*” (*rough*) altogether.

What people call the etymological consciousness of the speaker



is strictly a matter of oratorical sentiment only, and it would remain nearly as strong as it is now, whatever spelling be adopted. But even if it should suffer here and there, we ought to bear in mind that, except for oratorical purposes, that consciousness, confined as it is to a very few educated people, is of very small importance, unless it has first been corrected by a strict etymological discipline. Without that, it often degenerates into what is called "popular etymology," and actually tends, in some cases, to vitiate the correct spelling of words.

I have frequently dwelt on this before, in order to show how, what is now called the etymological or historical spelling of words, is, in many cases, utterly unetymological and unhistorical. We spell *to delight*, and thus induce many people to believe that this word is somehow connected with *light* (*lux*), or *light* (*levis*); whereas the old spelling was *to delyt* or *to delite* (Tyndale), representing the old French *deleiter*. On the other hand we find for *quite* and *smite*, the old spelling *quight*, *smight*, which may be old and historical, but is decidedly unetymological.

*Sovereign* and *foreign* are spelt as if they were connected with *reign* (*regnum*); the true etymology of the former being *superanus*, Old French *sorvain*, Old English *soveraine*; while *foreign* is the late Latin *foraneus*; Old French, *forain*; Old English, *forein*. And why do we write *to feign*? Archbishop Trench ("English Past and Present," p. 238) thinks the *g* in *feign* is eloquent to the eye; but its eloquence is misleading. *To feign* is not taken from Latin *finco*, as little as *honour* is taken from Latin *honor*. *To feign* comes from the Old French *faindre*; it was in Old English *fayner* and *feyner*, and it was therefore a mere etymological point, to insert the *g* of the Latin *finco*, and the French *feignant*. The Old English *shammasst* (Orm.), formed like *stedefasst* (steadfast), is now spelt *shamefaced*, as if it had something to do with a blushing face. *Aghast*, instead of the Old English *agast*, is supposed to look more frightful because it reminds us of *ghost*. The French *lanterne* was written *lant-horn*, as if it had been so called from the transparent sheets of horn that enclosed the light. The *s* in *island* owes its origin to a mistaken belief that the word is connected with *isle* (*insula*), whereas it is the A.S. *ealand* (Ger. *eiland*), that is, water-land. The spelling *iland* was still current in Shakespeare's time. In *aisle*, too, the *s* is unetymological, though it is historical, as having been taken over from the Old French *aisle*.

This tendency to alter the spelling in order to impart to a word, at all hazards, an etymological character, begins even in Latin, where *postumus*, a superlative of *post*, was sometimes written *posthumus*, as if, when applied to a late-born son, it was derived from *humus*. In English, this false spelling is retained in *posthumous*. *Cena* was spelt by people who wanted to show their knowledge of Greek, *cena*, as if connected with *κοινή*.

But now let us look more carefully into the far more important

statement, that the English language, if written phonetically, would really lose its historical and etymological character. The first question is, in what sense can the present spelling of English be called historical? We have only to go back a very short way in order to see the modern upstart character of what is called historical spelling. We now write *pleasure*, *measure*, and *feather*, but not very long ago, in Spenser's time, these words were spelt *plesure*, *mesure*, *fether*. Tyndale wrote *frute*; the *i* in *fruit* is a mere restoration of the French spelling. For *debt*, on the contrary, we find, but three or four hundred years ago, *dett*. This is more historical therefore than *debt*, because in French, from which the word was borrowed, the *b* had disappeared, and it was a purely etymological fancy to restore it. The *b* was likewise re-introduced in *doubt*, but the *p* was not restored into *count* (Fr. *compter*, Lat. *computare*), where *p* had at least the same right as *b* in *doute*. Thus *receipt* resumes the Latin *p*, but *deceit* does without it. There is another *b* which has a certain historical air in some English words, but which was originally purely phonetic, and is now simply superfluous. The old word for *member* was *lim*. In such compounds as *lim-lama*, *lim(b)-lame*, *lim-leas* *lim(b)less*, it was impossible to avoid the intercalation of a *b* in pronunciation. In this manner the *b* crept in, and we have now to teach that in *limb*, *crumb* (*crume*), *thumb* (*thuma*) the *b* must be written, but not pronounced. Again, *tung* (Ger. *zunge*), *yung* (Ger. *jung*), as spelt by Spenser, have a more historical aspect than *tongue* and *young*.

If we wished to write historically, we ought to write *salm* instead of *psalm*, for the initial *p*, being lost in pronunciation, was dropt in writing at a very early time (Anglo-Saxon *sealm*), and was re-introduced simply to please some ecclesiastical etymologists.

In what sense can it be called historical spelling if the old plurals of *mouse* and *louse*, which were *mys* and *lys*, are now spelt *mice* and *lice*? The plural of *goose* is not spelt *geece*, but *geese*, yet everybody knows how to pronounce it. The same mistaken attempt at an occasional phonetic spelling has separated *dice* from *die*, and *pence* from *pens*, i.e. *penyes*; while in *nurse*, where the spelling *nurce* would have been useful, as reminding us of its true etymon, *nourrice*, the *c* has been replaced by *s*.

There are, in fact, many spellings which would be at the same time more historical and more phonetic. Why write *little*, when no one pronounces *liddle*, and when the old spelling was *lytel*? Why *girdle*, when the old spelling was *girdel*? The same rule applies to nearly all words ending in *le*, such as *sickle*, *ladle*, *apple*, &c., where the etymology is completely obscured by the present orthography. Why *scent*, but *dis-sent*, when even Milton still wrote *sent*? Why *ache*, instead of the Shakespearian *ake*? Why *cat*, but *kitten*; why *cow*, but *kine*? Why *accede*, *precede*, *secede*, but *exceed*, *proceed*, *succeed*? Why, indeed, except to waste the precious time of children?

And if it is difficult to say what constitutes historical spelling,

it is equally perplexing to define the real meaning of etymological spelling. For, where are we to stop? It would be considered very unetymological were we to write *nee* instead of *knee*, *now* instead of *know*, *night* instead of *knight*; yet no one complains about the loss of the initial *h*, the representative of an original *k*, in *loaf*, A.S. *hlaf* (cf. *κλίβανος*), in *ring*, A.S. *hring*; in *lute*, *ladder*, *neck*, &c.

If we are to write etymologically, then why not return to *loverd*, or *Alaford*, instead of *lord*? to *nose-thrill*, or *nosethirle* instead of *nostril*; to *swister* instead of *sister*? which would not be more troublesome than *sword*. *Wif-mann* surely would be better than *woman*; *meadwife* better than *midwife*; *godspel* better than *gospel*, *ortyard* better than *orchard*, *puisne* better than *puny*. Frequently the present recognised spelling looks etymological, but is utterly unetymological. *Righteous* looks like an adjective in *-ous*, such as *plenteous*, but it is really a Saxon word, *rightwis*, i.e. *rightwise*, formed like *otherwise*, &c.

*Could* be written with an *l* in analogy to *would*, but while the *l* is justified in *would* from *will*, and *should* from *shall*, we find the Old English imperfect of *can* written *cuthe*, then *couthe*, *coude*. The *l*, therefore, is neither phonetic nor etymological. Nothing, again, can be more misleading to an etymologist than the present spelling of *whole* and *hale*. Both come from the same source, the Gothic *hail-s*, Sanskrit *kalya-s* meaning originally, *fit*, *ready*; then *sound*, *complete*, *whole*. In Anglo-Saxon we have *hæl*, *whole*; and *hal*, *healthy*, without any trace of a *w*, either before or after. The Old English *halsum*, *wholesome*, is the German *hailsam*. *Whole*, therefore, is a mere misspelling, the *w* having probably been added in analogy to *who*, *which*, &c. From a purely etymological point of view, the *w* is wrongly left out before *h* in *how*; for as Anglo-Saxon *hwa* became *why*, Anglo-Saxon *hwa* should have become *whow*.

If we really attempted to write etymologically, we should have to write *bridegroom* without the *r*, because *groom* is a mere corruption of *guma*, man, Anglo-Saxon *bryd-guma*. We should have to write *burse* instead of *purse*, as in *disburse*. In fact, it is difficult to say, where we should stop. Why not write *metal* instead of *mettle*, *worthship* instead of *worship*, *chirurgeon* instead of *surgeon*, *furhlong* (i.e. furrow long) instead of *furlong*, *feordhing* (i.e. fourth part) instead of *farthing*? If we write *puny* *puisne*, we might as well write *post-natus*. We might spell *coy*, *quietus*; *pert*, *apertus*; *priest*, *presbyter*; *master*, *magister*; *sexton*, *sacristan*; *alms*, *eleemosyne*, &c. If anybody will tell me at what date etymological spelling is to begin, whether at 1000 A.D., or at 1000 A.D., or at 500 A.D., I am willing to discuss the question. Till then, I beg leave to say that etymological spelling would play greater havoc in English than phonetic spelling, even if we were to draw a line not more than five hundred years ago.

The strongest arguments, therefore, against phonetic spelling, are, after all, but very partially true.

Here and there, no doubt, the etymology and history of an English word might be obscured by phonetic spelling; as if, for instance, we wrote "Urop" instead of *Europe*. But even then analogy would help us, and teach those who know Greek, of whom there are not many, that "Ur" in such words as *Europe*, *Eurydice*, represented the Greek *εὐρύς*. The real answer, however, is, that no one could honestly call the present system of spelling either historical or etymological; and I believe that, taken as a whole, the loss occasioned by consistent phonetic spelling would hardly be greater than the gain.

Another objection urged against phonetic spelling, viz., that with it it would be impossible to distinguish homonyms, must be met in the same way. No doubt it is a certain advantage if in writing we can distinguish *right*, *rite*, *write*, and *wright*. But if, in the hurry of conversation, there is hardly ever a doubt which word is meant, surely there would be much less danger in the slow process of reading a continuous sentence. If various spellings of the same word are necessary to point out different meanings, we should require eight spellings for *box*, to signify a chest, a Christmas gift, a hunting seat, a tree, a slap, to sail round, seats in a theatre, and the front seat on a coach; and this principle would have to be applied to above six hundred words. Who would undertake to provide all these variations of the present uniform spelling of these words? And we must not forget that, after all, in reading a page we are seldom in doubt whether *sole* means a fish, or the *sole* of a foot, or is used as an adjective. If there is at any time any real difficulty, language provides its own remedy. It either drops such words as *rite* and *sole*, replacing them by *ceremony* and *only*, or it uses a periphrastic expression, such as the sole of the foot, or the sole and only ground, &c.

Thus far I have tried to answer the really important arguments which have been brought forward against phonetic spelling. I have done so with special reference to the powerful remonstrances of Archbishop Trench, and his most able pleading in favour of the established system of orthography. As a mere scholar, I fully share his feelings, and I sincerely admire his eloquent advocacy. I differ from him because I do not think, as he does, that the loss entailed by phonetic spelling would be so great as we imagine; or that it would be all on one side. Besides, unless he can show how a reform of spelling is not only for the present to be avoided, but altogether to be rendered unnecessary, I consider that the sooner it is taken in hand the better. It seems to me that the Archbishop looks on the introduction of phonetic spelling as a mere crotchet of a few scholars, or as an attempt on the part of some half-educated persons, wishing to avoid the trouble of learning how to spell correctly. If that were so, I quite agree with him that public opinion would never ~~acquire~~ sufficient force for carrying their scheme. But there is a ~~positive~~ power behind these phonetic reformers which the Archbishop has

hardly taken into account. I mean the misery endured by millions of children at school, who might learn in one year, and with real advantage to themselves, what they now require four or five years to learn, and seldom succeed in learning after all. If the evidence of such men as Mr. Ellis is to be depended on, and I believe they are willing to submit to any test, then surely the loss of some historical and etymological *souvenirs* would weigh little against the happiness of millions of children, and the still higher happiness of millions of Englishmen and Englishwomen, growing up as the heirs to all the wealth and strength of English literature, or unable to read even their Bible. Here it is where I venture to differ from the Archbishop, not as being sanguine as to any immediate success, but simply as feeling it a duty to help in a cause which at present is most unpopular. The evil day may be put off for a long time, particularly if the weight of such men as Archbishop Trench is thrown into the other scale. But unless language ceases to be language, and writing ceases to be writing, the day will surely come when peace will have to be made between the two. Germany has appointed a Government Commission to consider what is to be done with German spelling. In America, too, some leading statesmen seem inclined to take up the reform of spelling on national grounds. Is there no statesman in England sufficiently proof against ridicule to call the attention of Parliament to what is a growing national misfortune?

Much, however, as I differ from the Archbishop on these grounds, I cannot sufficiently deprecate the tone in which his powerful opposition has been met by many of the upholders of phonetic spelling. Nay, I must go still further, and frankly confess that to one of his arguments I find it difficult, at present, to give a satisfactory answer.

"It is a mere assumption," the Archbishop remarks, "that all men pronounce all words alike; or that whenever they come to spell a word they will exactly agree as to what the outline of its sound is. Now we are sure men will not do this, from the fact that, before there was any fixed and settled orthography in our language, when, therefore, everybody was more or less a phonographer, seeking to write down the word as it sounded to *him*, for he had no other law to guide him, the variations of spelling are infinite. Take, for instance, the word *sudden*, which does not seem to promise any great scope for variety. I have myself met with this word spelt in no less than fourteen ways among our early writers. Again, in how many ways was Raleigh's name spelt, or Shakspeare's? The same is evident from the spelling of uneducated persons in our own day. They have no other rule but the sound to guide them. How is it that they do not all spell alike?"—(English Past and Present, p. 203.)

Like most men who plead with their heart as well as with their head, the Archbishop has here overlooked one obvious answer to his question. They do not spell alike because they have been brought up with a system of spelling in which the same sound can be represented in ten different ways, and in which hardly any one letter is restricted to one phonetic power only. If children were brought up with a system in which each letter had but one sound, and in

which the same sound was always represented by the same sign—and this is the very essence of phonetic writing—then it would be simply impossible that they should dream of writing *sudden* in 14, or *Woburn* in 140, different ways.

But for all that there is some truth in the Archbishop's remark; and if we compare the different ways in which the advocates of phonetic spelling—men like Pitman, Bell, Ellis, Withers, Jones—write the same words, even when using the same phonetic alphabet, we shall see that the difficulty pointed out by the Archbishop is a real one. Every one knows how differently the same words always have been and still are pronounced in different parts of England. And it is not only in towns and counties that these peculiarities prevail; there are certain words which one family pronounces differently from another; and there are besides the studied and unstudied peculiarities of individual speakers. To convince people that one pronunciation is right and the other wrong, seems utterly hopeless. I have heard a highly cultivated man defending his dropping the *h* at the beginning of certain words, by the unanswerable argument that in the place where he was brought up, no one pronounced these initial *h*'s. What Scotchman would admit that his pronunciation was faulty? What Irishman would submit to laws of spelling passed in London? And what renders argument on any niceties of pronunciation still more difficult is, that both the ear and the tongue are most treacherous witnesses. I have heard Americans maintain in good earnest that there was much less of nasal twang in America than in England. People are not aware how they pronounce, and how differently they pronounce one and the same word. As a foreigner I have had ample opportunities for observation on this point. Some friends would tell me, for instance, that *world* was pronounced like *whirl'd*, *father* like *farther*, *nor* (before consonants) like *gnaw*, *bud* like *bird*, *burst* like *bust*, *for* like *fur*, *birth* like *berth*; that the vowels had the same sound in *where* and *there*, in *not* and *war*, in *God* and *gaudy*; while others assured me that no one but a foreigner could think so. And the worst is that even the same person does not always pronounce the same word in exactly the same manner. Constantly, when I asked a friend to repeat a word which he had just pronounced, he would pronounce it again, but with a slight difference. The mere fact of his trying to pronounce well would give to his pronunciation a conscious and emphatic character. The preposition *of* is pronounced by most people "*uv*," but if cross-examined, many will say that they pronounce *ov*, but the *o* not exactly like *off*.

The confusion becomes greatest when it is attempted to identify the pronunciation, say of a vowel in German with a vowel in English. No two Englishmen and no two Germans seemed to be able to agree on what they heard with their ears, or what they said with their tongues; and the result in the end is that no vowel in German was really the same as any other vowel in English. To take one or two instances from Mr.

Ellis's key to Palæotype, I can hear no difference between the *a* in Italian *mano*, English *father*, and German *mahnen*, unless I restrict my observations to the utterance of certain individuals; whereas I do hear a very decided, and generally adopted, difference between the vowels in German *böcke* and French *jeune*. Mr. Ellis, touching on the same difficulty, remarks, "Mr. Bell's pronunciation, in many instances, differs from that which I am accustomed to give, especially in foreign words. Both of us may be wrong." Mr. Sweet remarks, page 10, "Mr. Ellis insists strongly on the monophthongic character of his own *ees* and *oos*. I hear his *ee* and *oo* as distinct diphthongs, not only in his English pronunciation, but also in his pronunciation of French, German, and Latin." If phonetic writing meant this minute photography of spoken sounds, in which Messrs. Bell and Ellis excel; if any attempt had ever been made to employ this hair-splitting machinery for a practical reform of English spelling, the objections raised by Archbishop Trench would be quite unanswerable. There would be fifty different ways of spelling English, and the confusion would be greater than it is now. Not even Mr. Bell's thirty-six categories of vowel sound would be sufficient to render every peculiarity of vowel quality, pitch, and quantity, with perfect accuracy." (See H. Sweet, "History of English Sounds," pp. 58, 68.) But this was never intended, and while conceding much to the Archbishop's arguments, I must not concede too much.

What I like in Mr. Pitman's system of spelling is exactly what I know has been found fault with by others, viz., that he does not attempt to refine too much, and to express in writing those endless shades of pronunciation which may be of the greatest interest to the student of acoustics, or of phonetics, as applied to the study of living dialects, but which, for practical as well as for scientific philological purposes, must be entirely ignored. Writing was never intended to photograph spoken languages: it was meant to indicate, not to paint, sounds. If Voltaire says, "L'écriture c'est la peinture de la voix," he is right; but when he goes on to say, "plus elle est ressemblante, meilleure elle est," I am not certain that, as in a picture of a landscape, so in a picture of the voice, a pre-Raphaelite minuteness may not destroy the very object of the picture. Language deals in broad colours, and writing ought to follow the example of language, which, though it allows an endless variety of pronunciation, restricts itself for its own purpose, for the purpose of expressing thought in all its modifications, to a very limited number of typical vowels and consonants. Out of the large number of vowel sounds, for instance, which have been catalogued from the various English dialects, those only can be recognised as constituent elements of the language which in, and by, their difference from each other convey a difference of meaning. Of such pregnant and thought-conveying vowels, English possesses no more than twelve. Whatever the minor shades of vowel sounds in English dialects may be, they do not enrich the

language as such, *i.e.*, they do not enable the speaker to convey more minute shades of thought than the twelve typical single vowels. Besides, there generally is what the French might call a phonetic solidarity in each dialect. If one vowel changes, the others are apt to follow, and the main object of language remains the same throughout, *viz.*, to prevent one word from running into another, and yet to abstain from minute phonetic distinctions, which an ordinary ear might find it difficult to grasp. This principle of phonetic solidarity is of great importance, not only in explaining the gradual changes of vowels, but also such general changes of consonants as we see, for instance, in the German *Lautverschiebung*. As soon as one place is left vacant, there is pressure to fill it, or so much of it as is left vacant, but no more.

There are, in fact, two branches, or at all events, two quite distinct practical applications of the science of Phonetics, which, for want of better names, I designate as *philological* and *dialectical*. There is what may be called a philological study of Phonetics, which is an essential part of the Science of Language, and has for its object to give a clear idea of the alphabet, not as written, but as spoken. It treats of the materials out of which, the instruments with which, and the process by which, vowels and consonants are formed; and after explaining how certain letters agree, and differ, in their material, in the instruments with which, and the process by which they are produced, it enables us to understand the causes and the results of what is called Phonetic Change. In many respects the most instructive treatment of the general theory of Phonetics is to be found in the *Prātisākhyas*; particularly in the oldest (400 B.C.), that attached to the *Rig Veda*.<sup>1</sup> Though the number of possible sounds may seem infinite, the number of real sounds used in Sanskrit or any other given language for the purpose of expressing different shades of meaning, is very limited. It is with these broad categories of sound alone that the *Prātisākhyas* deal; and it is for a proper understanding of these that the Science of Language has to include within its sphere a careful study of Phonetics.

The dialectical study of Phonetics has larger objects. It wishes to exhaust all possible sounds which can be produced by the vocal organs, little concerned as to whether these sounds occur in any real language or not. It is particularly useful for the purpose of painting, with the utmost accuracy, the actual pronunciation of individuals, and of fixing the faintest shades of dialectic variety. The most marvellous achievement in this branch of applied phonetics may be seen in Mr. Bell's "*Visible Speech*."

These two branches of phonetic science, however, should be kept carefully distinct. As the foundation of a practical alphabet, like-

(1) "*Rig-Veda-Prātisākhya, Das älteste Lehrbuch der Vedischen Phonetik, Sanskrit Text mit Übersetzung und Anmerkungen, herausgegeben,*" von F. Max Müller. Leipzig, 1869.



wise as the only safe foundation for the Science of Language, we want philological or theoretic Phonetics. We want an understanding of those general principles and those broad categories of sound which are treated in the *Prâtisākhya*s ; we do not want any of the minute dialectic distinctions which have no grammatical purpose, and are therefore outside the pale of grammatical science.

But when we want to exhaust all possible shades of sound, when we want to photograph the peculiarities of certain dialects, or measure the deviations in the pronunciation of individuals by the most minute degrees, we then must avail ourselves of that exquisite artistic machinery constructed by Mr. Bell, and handled with so much skill by Mr. A. J. Ellis, though few only will be able to use it with real success.

I have sometimes been blamed for having insisted on Phonetics being recognised as the foundation of the Science of Language. Professor Benfey and other scholars protested against the chapter I had devoted to Phonetics in the Second Series of my Lectures, as an unnecessary innovation, and those protests have become still stronger of late. But here, too, we must distinguish between two things. Philological or general Phonetics are, I hold as strongly as ever, an integral part of the Science of Language ; dialectic Phonetics may be useful here and there, but they should be kept within their proper sphere ; otherwise, I admit as readily as any one else, they obscure rather than reveal the broad and massive colours of sound which language uses for its ordinary work.

If we reflect a little, we shall see that the philological conception of a vowel is something totally different from its purely acoustic or dialectic conception. The former is chiefly concerned with the sphere of possible variation, and the latter with the purely phenomenal individuality of each vowel. To the philologist the three vowels in *septimus*, for instance, whatever their exact pronunciation may have been at different times, and in different provinces of the Roman Empire, are potentially one and the same. We look on *septimus* and ἑβδόμος as on Sanskrit *saptamas*, and only by knowing that *e*, *i*, and *u* in *septimus* are all representatives of a short *a*, or that *optimus* stands for the more ancient *optumus* and *optomos*, do we take in at one glance the whole history and possible variation of these vowels in different languages and dialects. Even where a vowel disappears completely, as in *gigno* for *gigeno*, in *πίπτω* for *πιπετω*, the mental eye of the philologist discerns and weighs what no ear can hear. And while in these cases the etymologist, disregarding the clearest variety of pronunciation, treats such vowels as *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u* as one and the same, in others where two vowels seem to have exactly the same sound to the dialectician, the philologist on his part perceives differences of the greatest importance. The *i* in *fides* and *cliens* may have the same sound as the *i* in *gigno* or *septimus*, the *u* of *luo* may not differ from the *u* in *optumus* or *lubens*, but their intrinsic value, their capabilities of

growth and decay, are totally different in each. We shall never be able to speak with anything like real scientific accuracy of the pronunciation of ancient languages, but even if we look to their written appearance only, we see again and again how vowels, written alike, are historically totally distinct. Grimm introduced the distinction between *ái* and *aí*, between *áu* and *ah*, not because it is by any means certain that the pronunciation of these diphthongs varied, but because he wished to indicate that the antecedents of *ái* and *áu* were different from those of *ai* and *au*. In Gothic *faihu* (Sk. pasu, pecu), *ai* is *a* shortened to *i*, and broken before *h* to *ai*; in Gothic *vait* (Sk. veda, *oḍa*), *ai* is radical *i* strengthened to *ái*. In Gothic *daihtar* (Sk. duhtar, *Δουγάρη*), *au* is radical *u* broken to *ah*; in *aihu*, oven (Sk. asua, *ἰπνό* = *ἰκνο* = *ἀκνο*), the *au* is *a*, darkened to *u*, and broken to *áu*; while in Gothic *báug* (*πέφουγα*), *au* is original *u* strengthened to *áu*. When we hear *ê* and *ô* in Gothic, we see *â*, just as we see Doric *ū* behind Ionic *η*. When we hear *e* in *canis*, we see Sanskrit *s*; when we hear *e* in *eruor*, we see Sanskrit *k*. When we hear *γ* in *γένος*, we see Aryan *g*; when we hear *γ* in *φλέγω*, we see Aryan *z*.

These few illustrations will explain, I hope, the essential difference in the application of phonetics to philology and dialectology, and will show that in the former our brush must of necessity be broad, while in the latter it must be fine. It is by mixing up two separate lines of research, each highly important in itself, that so much confusion has of late been occasioned. The value of purely phonetic observations should on no account be underrated; but it is necessary, for that very reason, that dialectical as well as philological phonetics should each be confined to their proper sphere. The philologist has much to learn from the phonetician, but he should never forget that here, as elsewhere, what is broad and typical is as important and as scientifically accurate as what is minute and special.

What is broad and typical is often more accurate even than what is minute and special. It might be possible, for instance, by a photographic process, to represent the exact position of the tongue and the inside walls of the mouth while we pronounce the Italian vowel *i*. But it would be the greatest mistake to suppose that this image gives us the only way in which that vowel is, and can be pronounced. Though each individual may have his own way of placing the tongue in pronouncing *i*, we have only to try the experiment in order to convince ourselves that, with some effort, we may vary that position in many ways and yet produce the sound of *i*. When, therefore, in my Lectures on the Science of Language, I gave pictures of the positions of the vocal organs required for pronouncing the typical letters of the alphabet, I took great care to make them typical, *i.e.* to leave them rough sketches rather than minute photographs. I cannot better express what I feel on this point than by quoting the words of Haeckel:

"For didactic purposes, simple schematic figures are far more useful than pictures preserving the greatest faithfulness to nature and carried out with the greatest accuracy." ("Ziele und Wege," p. 37).

To return, after this digression, to Mr. Pitman's alphabet, I repeat that it recommends itself to my mind by what others call its inaccuracy. It shows its real and practical wisdom by not attempting to fix any distinctions which are not absolutely necessary. If, for instance, we take the guttural tenuis, we find that English recognises one *k* only, although its pronunciation varies considerably. It is sometimes pronounced so as to produce almost a sharp crack; sometimes it has a deep, hollow sound; and sometimes a soft, lazy, *mouillé* character. It varies considerably according to the vowels which follow it, as anybody may hear, nay feel, if he pronounces, in succession, *cot*, *cool*, *car*, *cat*, *kit*. But as English does not use these different *k*'s for the purpose of distinguishing words or grammatical forms, one broad category only of voiceless guttural checks has to be admitted in writing English. In the Semitic languages the case is different; not only are *kaf* and *kof* different in sound, but this difference is used to distinguish different meanings.

Or if we take the vowel *a* in its original, pure pronunciation, like Italian *a*, we can easily perceive that it has different colours in different counties of England. Yet in writing it may be treated as one, because it has but one and the same grammatical intention, and does not convey a new meaning till it exceeds its widest limits. Good speakers in England pronounce the *a* in *last* like the pure Italian *a*; with others it becomes broad, with others thin. But though it may thus oscillate considerably, it must not encroach on the province of *e*, which would change its meaning to *lest*; nor on the province of *o*, which would change it to *lost*; nor on the province of *u*, which would change it to *lust*.

The difficulty, therefore, which Archbishop Trench has pointed out is really restricted to those cases where the pronunciation of vowels—for it is with vowels chiefly that we are troubled—varies so much as to overstep the broadest limits of one of the recognised categories of sound, and to encroach on another. If we take the word *fast*, which is pronounced very differently even by educated people, there would be no necessity for indicating in writing the different shades of pronunciation which lie between the sound of the short Italian *a* and the long *a* as heard in *father*. But when the *a* in *fast* is pronounced like the *a* in *fat*, then the necessity of a new graphic exponent would arise, and Archbishop Trench would be right in twitting phonetic reformers with sanctioning two spellings for the same word.

I could mention the names of three bishops, one of whom pronounced the vowel in *God* like *gaud*, another like *rod*, a third like *gad*. The last pronunciation would probably be condemned by everybody, but the other two would remain, sanctioned by the highest authority, and therefore retained in phonetic writing.

So far, then, I admit that Archbishop Trench has pointed out a real difficulty inherent in phonetic writing; but what is that one difficulty compared with the difficulties of the present system of English spelling? It would not be honest to try to evade his charge, by saying that there is but one pronunciation recognised by the usage of educated people. That is not so, and those who know best the biology of language, know that it cannot be so. The very life of language consists in a constant friction between the centripetal force of custom and the centrifugal force of individual freedom. Against that difficulty therefore there is no remedy. Only here again the Archbishop seems to have overlooked the fact that the difficulty belongs to the present system of spelling nearly as much as to the phonetic system. There is but one recognised way of spelling, but everybody pronounces according to his own idiosyncrasies. It would be the same with phonetic spelling. One pronunciation, the best recognised, would have to be adopted as a standard in phonetic writing, leaving to every Englishman his freedom to pronounce as seemeth good to him. We should lose nothing of what we now possess, and all the advantages of phonetic writing would remain unimpaired. The real state of the case is, therefore, this—No one defends the present system of spelling; every one admits the serious injury which it inflicts on national education. Everybody admits the practical advantages of phonetic spelling, but after that, all exclaim that a reform of spelling, whether partial or complete, is impossible. Whether it is impossible or not, I gladly leave to men of the world to decide. As a scholar, as a student of the history of language, I simply maintain that in every written language a reform of spelling is, sooner or later, inevitable. No doubt the evil day may be put off. I have little doubt that it will be put off for many generations, and that a real reform will probably not be carried except concurrently with a violent social convulsion. Only let the question be argued fairly. Let facts have some weight, and let it not be supposed by men of the world that those who defend the principles of the *Phonetic Nuz* are only teetotalers and vegetarians, who have never learned how to spell.

If I have spoken strongly in support of Mr. Pitman's system, it is not because on all points I consider it superior to the systems prepared by other reformers, particularly by Messrs. Ellis and Jones, who have devised schemes of phonetic spelling that dispense with any new types; but chiefly because it has been tested so largely, and has stood the test well. Mr. Pitman's *Phonetic Journal* has now been published thirty-four years, and if it is known that it is published weekly in 9,250 copies, each copy representing at least four or five readers, it may not seem so very foolish, after all, if we imagine that there is some vital power in that insignificant germ.

F. MAX MÜLLER.

## SOME TRUTHS ABOUT EGYPT.

THAT Englishmen are as a rule blind, stone-blind, as to the condition of the Turkish empire, there can be no manner of doubt. For long it has been impossible to use any portion of the English daily press to lift the veil of darkness which has hidden the rottenness and the iniquities of the Government of the Sultan and his feudatories. It has been the interest of an influential portion of the monied classes to conceal the symptoms of the sick man's disease and decay, and they have accordingly been carefully and effectually hidden. Writers whose letters on other subjects have meanwhile been freely and constantly inserted in the daily papers, both Liberal and Conservative, and who have tried to set the truth about Turkey before their countrymen, have been over and over again disappointed, and have tried in vain. Consular authorities and diplomatic agents in the East have, it is loudly whispered, received instructions or hints from the Foreign Office to report nothing which will appear in print in a Blue-Book contrary to the interests of the Turkish empire. "It is part of my official religion," said a candid English consular official of an Oriental town, "to love the Turks and to hate the Greeks, but after years spent in Turkey I find myself obliged to act in a precisely contrary manner."

It is not, however, the object of the present paper to expose the enormities and the cruelties of misrule in Turkey proper, but to direct attention to Egypt, and to attempt to disabuse the mind of the English public of certain utterly erroneous ideas which are commonly entertained with respect to that country, in which, through the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, they have now a direct interest, and consequently a direct responsibility. The English press, since the Turkish bubble has begun to burst, has lately talked much of the independence of Egypt. Now what does the independence of Egypt really mean? For when evils are inveterate in a system, the withdrawal of restraints, however small, can but make those evils more inveterate still. It means

1. The continuance of slavery.
  2. The continuance of forced labour, with its attendant hardships and cruelties.
  3. A brutal conscription.
  4. Wholesale confiscation of land and other property.
  5. Grinding taxation, to support the unbounded luxury and caprices of an irresponsible Turkish and consequently alien tyrant.
1. It is commonly believed in England that the Khedive is

opposed to slavery. The man has so often said so to the Prince of Wales, and to other noble guests, that the mass of Englishmen have come to believe him. Nothing, however, can be more absolutely contrary to the truth. The real fact is that the Khedive is the largest slave-owner in Egypt. There is not one of the almost numberless palaces of his Highness, and his sons and pashas, which is not full to overflowing of slaves of both sexes, and they are to be found in private houses throughout the whole length of the land of Egypt. The Khedive himself continually buys them; and in addition to his domestic slaves, his Highness, as he increases his stock of women, increases also his stock of those unhappy beings who are specially mutilated, and that under circumstances of the most revolting barbarity, in order to preserve the fidelity of his concubines and wives, which he finds he cannot secure by expensive presents of French jewellery. Let it be especially noted that,—to put Georgians and other whites, who are supplied through the Turkish market, out of the question,—African slaves can only be brought into Egypt by way of Suez or by the Nile, and that one single word from the Viceroy could stop the importation of a single slave into Egypt, or arrest their progress at any point on their way to Cairo. That word, however, has never been spoken. Slaves are seen daily descending the Nile in open day. I have repeatedly seen them myself when ascending and descending the Nile in a dahabceah. I have seen slaves chained together with iron chains; and on one occasion a slave heavily loaded with irons attempted to end his miseries by throwing himself into the Nile before my own Nile-boat. Only last year I witnessed the sale of a young female slave by a Government official at Assouan, who made £5 by the transaction, and who pulled out her tongue, showed her teeth, and indicated the good points of the poor little shrinking creature with all the zest of an experienced dealer. This year I travelled in the train from Suez with an Egyptian soldier who had with him a little Christian slave-boy whom he had kidnapped from Abyssinia, while Christian England is looking on with abject admiration at the spectacle of the only Christian country in Africa being subjugated by her Mohammedan ally. It is true that open slave-markets are abolished, but I could buy a slave myself to-morrow, if only I did it *sub rosa*, for fear of the European consuls. In saying thus much, I do not wish it to be understood that I believe that slaves in Egypt are on the whole ill-treated. On the contrary, I think that when once bought they are well used, like other valuable property, but they are undoubtedly treated with great cruelty by the slavers who bring them from the interior; and a relic which was shown me in the British Consulate at Tarabulûs Gharb (Tripoli in Barbary) shows to what lengths a Turkish pasha is capable of going with his

chattel. This relic is a massive collar of iron, spiked like that of a mastiff, and so contrived that the wretch upon whose neck it was *welded* could not move his head without being impaled. This ornament was filed off the neck of a slave who had escaped from the palace of the Pasha.

The attitude of England towards both Turkey and Egypt in the matter of slavery must be the subject of continual amazement to every unprejudiced observer. But it shows the power of the almighty dollar. Englishmen commonly believe that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, but they stop the application of this wholesome if homely maxim when they come to deal with those Mohammedan tyrants with whose well-being the pecuniary interests of a part of the English people are supposed to be bound up. Slavery in Zanzibar or Cuba is an abomination to be abhorred by Christian England, but slavery in Turkey or Egypt is a thing to be—well, winked at and condoned, while at the same time Christian English money is to be lavished and lent to any extent in order to bolster up the very two powers which are the greatest supporters of slavery in the world! Englishmen, again, seem to take pride in the not altogether bloodless exploits of distinguished filibusters like Baker and others, but the knowing ones of Egypt see in those costly expeditions only the intention of the Khedive to open up new fields for the procuring of slaves and slave labour. Certainly, as appears from Sir S. Baker's own admissions, his Egyptian Highness has given a handle to such an opinion by attaching to Sir Samuel's retinue a ruffian who was a notorious slave-driver, and by refusing, spite of his own plighted word, to punish that same person when sent back to Cairo in disgrace.

2. *The Independence of Egypt means the Continuance of Forced Labour.*—It is astonishing that the majority of Englishmen should imagine that a stop has been put to this infamous system, when the very reverse is the case. The Egyptian Fellaheen and the poor generally are liable to forced labour—first, at the public works—a term of very elastic meaning in a country where all things exist for the ruling despot—such as railways, the repair of dykes, the making of canals, the construction of bridges; and secondly, on the estates and at the sugar manufactories of the Khedive. For the first of these the people receive no payment, and keep themselves; for the second they keep themselves for fifty days, and afterwards occasionally receive a few dry, gritty rusks a day, and a small nominal payment, which, however, in many instances, and especially in remote places, is either altogether withheld or paid only in part. I have the word of the European superintendent of one of the largest of the Khedive's sugar-works that no payment has been made during his term of office, a period of several years, to any of the people

employed. What takes place is this: Some hundreds of hands are wanted at one of the Khedive's estates or works. An order is issued. A steamer with soldiers on board is sent up the Nile, towing several huge barges of iron or wood. It anchors opposite a town or village, and soon hundreds of men, boys, and girls, many of tender age, are seen hurrying and being driven down to the river-bank, clutching such small bags of bread or fragments of rusk as they can collect in haste, and accompanied by their parents, friends, wives, and children, who rend the air with their shrill screams and lamentations, for they well know that many a dear face will never be seen again. Neither the only sons of widows or of blind and aged parents, nor the fathers of helpless infants are spared. The despot requires them—the bastinado and the prison are the cost of refusal. The whole crowd are rapidly swept into the barges, where, without regard to age or sex, they are packed together like herrings in a barrel. The steamer and the barges then start with their living freight, many of whom will never return to their homes from the distant sugar or cotton estate to which they are conveyed. During the process of their being driven on board and during the voyage no more account is taken of the occupants of the barges than of brute beasts. Arrived at the scene of their labours, an incessant mill-horse grind of toil ensues. There is no Friday rest, no moment's space allowed for recreation. Both sexes labour under the eye of taskmasters armed with sticks, whips, konobushes, which are freely and needlessly applied to the often naked and at all events only one-shirted backs of those poor "free" labourers, whom the charity of England has not yet learned to pity, and whose brutal taskmaster-in-chief she has not yet learned to condemn. I have myself seen little, tender, emaciated girls staggering under heavy loads of earth, who have been lashed each time they ascended the high bank at which they were at work, and even prodded in the naked breasts with sharp palm-sticks. I have seen them sinking upon the earth, fainting under their loads. No sort of shelter is provided for these unfortunates, though the nights of an Egyptian winter can be very cold, and a single shirt is their only garment. Many have not even this. On the filthy floor of the sugar factory, or on the bare stubbly ground of the cane-field—where they cease working, there they lie down to take their scanty rest, and are succeeded on the instant by other gangs awakened to relieve them. Thus, night and day, without intermission, the work goes on, and the cringing parasites of the little Egyptian Court, and the base crew of servile European speculators who prey upon the Khedive, and the Consuls-General who love to speak smooth things, and Cook's tourists, and the reporters of the English "dailies," lift up their hands in fulsome admiration, and proclaim to the world that so many more pounds of sugar have been produced in Egypt in *this* than in the



*previous years.* These people forget to proclaim also how much blood—and that human blood—has been expended in its refinement and elaboration! An English friend visiting one of the Khedive's sugar factories a few days ago, observed a man at work loaded with immense iron chains. On inquiring the reason, he was informed that the poor wretch had been detected sucking a few inches of sugar-cane, and was accordingly condemned *to work in chains for five days and nights, without sleep, and without being allowed to stop to eat.*

One word more upon this head only. In speaking of public works it should be remembered that under this term are included railways which are the exclusive, private property of the Viceroy, and intended only for the conveyance of produce from his estates, and to whose trains a few battered carriages only are attached for passengers to whom time is no object; and canals to the Vice-regal estates, into whose sacred waters no common man's shadoof is allowed to dip.

3. *The Independence of Egypt implies a brutal and wholesale Conscription.*—In some European countries, where an universal liability to serve in the army exists—and I am very far from asserting that such a liability is indefensible and, on the whole, inexpedient—the conscripted are, at all events, called on to defend their country, their wives, their families, and their homes. In Egypt, on the contrary, this dreadful peculiarity exists, that the poor Arab conscripts are compelled to execute the sole will of a capricious tyrant of an alien and inferior race, and to rival the cruelties of the Hebrew task-masters of old, by harrying and exacting money from their own countrymen. In no country is ancient tragedy so often re-enacted as in Egypt! At the present time, while the war mania prevails in the Viceroy's mind, and men are needed to enable him to gratify the passions of religious hate and vain ostentation by foreign conquest, the conscription is being carried on in the most oppressive and arbitrary manner possible. In Cairo, even, respectable young men, of whom many are husbands and fathers of families, are arrested by the soldiery and police in the public streets and cafés, thrown into prison upon false and trumped-up charges, and if money is not forthcoming for their release, pressed into the army. In the villages men are simply seized by force, chained or welded together in wooden stocks—a brutal practice, of which I have seen examples within the last few days—and dragged to the nearest barracks, to be dealt with by low Turkish officers and American generals from the United States, who have followed the base example of Hobart Pasha in selling their swords to work the will of a despot. At this time the country villages and towns everywhere resound with the cries of women whose husbands and sons have been torn from them by force.

4. *The Independence of Egypt means the perpetuation of the system*

*of the confiscation of land and property to the Khedive's use.*—When Ahab sets his heart on Naboth's vineyard, or rather, when the Viceroy sets his heart upon a tract of land for a sugar plantation or cotton estate, the occupants—they can scarcely be called *owners* when they have to pay on the average £2 a year per ferdân in gold to Effendeena—the occupants are compelled to sell their land at a valuation in which they are themselves passive instruments and without a voice. The sum, generally £6 per ferdân, which is fixed on is, however, generally paid. This small sum, however, is soon spent, and the Fellaheen are thus completely swept away to take refuge and gain a living how and where they may, and are forced to part with their camels, oxen, goats, sheep, and donkeys for what they will fetch at the time. Thus, instead of the beautiful agriculture, and varied crops of wheat, barley, dhourrah, clover, beans, vetches, and flax, which delight the eye, and make the rich land of Egypt seem even as the Garden of the Lord, and which, in addition, afford food for an industrious, peaceable, and honest population and their beautiful cattle, nothing is seen but vast expanses of a single crop—sugar or cotton—and that the property of *one* man, who thus enriches himself at the expense and to the ruin of his own subjects. There is another and still baser form of confiscation. When His Highness wants camels or donkeys for any of his speculations, an order is issued to the Sheyks el Belad, and the country people, including sometimes the nearest Bedoucen of the desert, are compelled to bring their animals, often very long distances, to some appointed place, where they are seized, valued by an inspector appointed by the Governor, and paid for, or *not* paid for, as the case may be. Agriculture is thus thrown back, and families ruined. From some parts of the country all the strongest and best donkeys have been carried off, and the breed permanently deteriorated. Lately, in the rich Province of Baheyrâ, vast numbers of camels have been seized at Damanhour, and an English eye-witness of the fact assures me that not one was paid for, the poor owners not being even allowed anything for their expenses on the way. These camels were simply confiscated in the name of Effendeena, and their owners driven away penniless. This account was afterwards confirmed by a native official. Donkeys and other animals are seized and confiscated in a similar manner. The accidental discovery of antiquities exposes the unlucky finder not only to the loss of the treasure trove, but to a severe flogging, and at times to imprisonment. The effect of this atrocious system is that a fine work of ancient art is generally broken up and sold piecemeal to the first comer, while objects of gold and silver at once find their way to the melting pot. The Turk is not only cruel and unjust, but excessively stupid.

5. *The Independence of Egypt signifies the Continuance of a Most Oppressive and Grinding System of Taxation which has a Show of Legality, and to Continual Exactions which have None.*—Up to the present time, when an annual tribute has to be paid by the Viceroy to the Sultan, it is clearly the interest of the latter to use what influence he possesses to prevent the over-taxation of the people. It is true that this influence has not been used as it ought, but it *might* be, and the fear of such a restraining power can scarcely fail to have had its effect on the Khedive. Make the Viceroy independent, and that slight safeguard is taken away. The real wonder is that the Egyptian Fellah can exist at all. For the land he occupies, and which was conquered for him by his Arabian forefathers, he has, as we have said, to pay to the Khedive on the average £2 per ferdân in gold. Every house is taxed, every palm-tree is taxed; in Cairo every donkey, and in the country every camel, ox, horse, and sheep. Besides this, under French tutelage octroi duties have been established in Cairo and other large towns, and the poor Cairene donkey-boys are forced to pay a tax upon every mouthful of clover consumed by their donkeys. A year or two ago there was a tax on donkey-boys, duty had to be paid on the one blue robe worn by the Fellaheen, and taxgatherers were stationed at the ferries and other public thoroughfares to arrest those whose scarfs did not bear the yellow Government brand. It can scarcely compensate the ground-down Fellah to know that the money thus wrung from him goes to enable his lord and master to add palace to palace, to support a disproportionate army for purposes of foreign aggression, and to add to his stock of eunuchs, third-rate French actresses, and Yankee generals.<sup>1</sup> Some years ago the land-tribute was demanded for several years in advance on the promise that the payers should be exempted in future, but this promise, it is almost needless to add, was never kept.<sup>2</sup> The fact is, the Khedive is much in the position of the fool who killed the goose that laid the golden eggs. The Fellaheen have been taxed more than they can bear, and though at the present time flogging is often resorted to in order to extort money, more money cannot be had. Meanwhile the poverty and misery of the people is extreme, although their sufferings are borne with marvellous resignation. A greater instance of God's goodness can scarcely be imagined than the cheerful, contented disposition with which he has endowed the down-trodden people of Egypt, who will repay the smallest act of justice and even a kind word or look with a grateful affection which is truly pathetic.

(1) An official estimated the number of the Khedive's wives, concubines, slaves, and other female attendants as amounting to 900 women! I am assured that this estimate is below rather than above the mark.

(2) Instances occurred of people offering their property to any one who would undertake to pay the taxes, and failing in this the land was snapped up by eunuchs and women of the harem. The bastinado was freely applied to exact this forced tax.

It is not, however, the poor alone who suffer from the extravagance and the dishonesty of their lord. A compulsory tax has been established upon the salaries of all Government officials, who are compelled to contribute one day's pay in each month, which sum is deducted from the sum owed them. In addition to this, salaries are paid with the utmost irregularity, officials receiving their pay months and even more than a year after it is due. The tendency of this, of course, is to induce them to exact money from those beneath them. The condition of the lower grades especially of those officials is much to be pitied, for they have a position to maintain, and to many of them an official dress is prescribed.

There are some, and these chiefly of the Cook's Tourist sort, who "do" Cairo in three days and the Nile in twenty, and of that class of servile Alexandrian traders who would scream with delight if the Khedive were to tumble for coppers in the Frank Square, who are for ever talking about the "progress" of Egypt. I wish I could think that there was progress. Change, indeed, there has been, but I doubt the progress. The question is not whether Cairo, or Alexandria, or Egypt has been Europeanized, and made more agreeable for the ordinary run of tourists, but whether the changes made really conduce to the well-being, happiness, and profit of the native inhabitants of the country. This may well admit of doubt, although it is hard to get an Englishman to believe that English institutions and customs are not the best possible for all the peoples upon earth, just as, in his sublime self-conceit, he is always wanting to thrust the Thirty-nine Articles down the throats of Christians of all the ancient Churches of Christendom. But let us see what the changes in Egypt amount to. The Khedive, then, has discarded the flowing Eastern dress, and waddles about in French broadcloth and varnished boots, and when he goes out, instead of riding a horse, like a man, he lolls in a luxurious French carriage. In Alexandria, it is true, some of the streets have been paved, but this has been done at the expense of Frank and Levantine merchants, and in spite of the Government rather than by its aid. In Cairo things are different. There the changes have been made by Effendeena himself. And what have we there? Instead of the wild, tangled garden of the once picturesque Esbeykeyeh, with its fine forest trees, and undergrowth of santon and roses, open to all the world, there is half the space sold to speculators for the erections of cafés and gambling hells, and the other half inclosed within a cast-iron French railing of monotonous design, and a parky, newly-planted garden within it, with a puddle with a punt and two swans in the centre, a Swiss chalet at each of the four gates, a vista ending in the chimney of some waterworks, a bit of rock-work, several grog-shops, and a kiosk where a band plays airs from "Madame Angot" in the afternoons.

For entrance to this paradise, (which, after all, is as pleasant as an English suburban tea-garden), His Highness charges the public a piastre a head. Then there is the new hotel (the Khedive's own), which would be an eyesore at Bognor or Harrogate; the Duke of Sutherland's new house, which resembles an aggregation of packing-boxes; and an English church which would be a disgrace to Mr. Compo. In place of the old, narrow streets—purposely narrow on account of the heat of the climate, but always cool and dry—there are new blazing thoroughfares, which are either blinding from dust and heat, or bathed with water to such an extent that the donkeys cannot keep their footing. It is certain that the climate of Cairo has been changed for the worse by the perpetual watering of the new streets and garden. A thick mist frequently hangs over that portion of the town where formerly the air was dry and healthy. To provide space for these new streets and squares, there has been a wholesale confiscation of private house property, and the wanton destruction of several splendid ancient mosques. Again, while the mosque of Sultan Hassan—the Westminster Abbey of Cairo, and perhaps the finest specimen of Arab architecture extant—is allowed to go to rack and ruin, the Khedive is erecting at vast expense a tasteless pile by its side. The citadel, with its unrivalled view—once the residence of the old Arab Caliphs—has been modernized, spoiled, and abandoned; while the Viceroy lives in the frightful palaces of Abdiu and Gozeesch, and flings away his people's money in the continual erection of uglier palaces still. One of the finest of the mosque-tombs of the Memlook Sultans is, moreover, used as a magazine of gunpowder. In fact, in less than twenty years at the present rate of destruction, not a single fine ancient building will be left in Cairo, once, but soon no longer to be the queen of Oriental cities.

Much has been said and written about the progress of education in Egypt, but, so far as the country poor are concerned, very little has been done. A short time since, a late distinguished consular official was appointed Director of Education in Egypt, and though many who admired his talents the most, wondered that he should condescend to accept a post under such a master, they at least hoped that there would be a marked progress in education. Scarcely, however, had this gentleman arrived at his post when he was sent back to England with a large salary, to push the Khedive's interests in England!

Again, the railway system of Egypt, although the mileage has been largely increased, has, so far as passenger traffic is concerned, decidedly gone back in efficiency, and nothing can be worse than the management and arrangements generally. There are but two good trains in all Egypt—the morning express from Cairo to

Alexandria, and *vice versâ*, and those are due to the pressure of the mercantile body in Alexandria.

The real fact appears to be that it is useless to hope for improvement in Egypt so long as it is governed by a Turk. It seems probable that it is impossible to improve a Turk by bringing him in contact with European civilization. You may make him worse, but you cannot make him better. The old-fashioned, bigoted Turk of Central Asia Minor, whom I have *not* seen, has, I do not doubt, many fine qualities. He is a "gentleman," he speaks the truth, his hospitality is unbounded, he believes in God, he says his prayers. But the civilized Turk, whom I *have* seen—a Turk, *i.e.*, of the stuff of which Sultans and Pashas are made—is quite a different being. He is bigoted without being religious; he is tyrannical, superstitious, cruel, luxurious. He is an accomplished liar, and his so-called civilization consists in his wearing French polished leather boots, drinking brandy and champagne, and importing a worn-out French actress. He is, in short, a whited sepulchre, not over and above fair without, but very foul indeed within. He is covered with French broadcloth, but scratch him and you see the low Tartar at once. From such a man a country can have no hope, and the more independent he is the worse he will be.

I pause a moment here to remark that one thing may fairly be said in favour of Egypt. The Christians in that country are far better treated than they are in Turkey. The massacres and martyrdoms of the Greek Islands and of the Lebanon have no counterpart on the banks of the Nile. This, perhaps, is not so much from the better feeling of the rulers as from the circumstance that the country is itself so narrow, and that the European Consuls are so numerous and so powerful. Indications, however, are not wanting that the will to injure is not absent. Recently the Khedive has forcibly closed the school of the U. S. A. Presbyterian schools at Koos, and Coptic Christians are now pressed into the army along with the rest of the population. It is alleged that great obstacles are placed in the way of the soldiers attending divine worship, but I have certainly seen many of them at the Aced-el-Ghitas on the eve of the Epiphany and at other festivals in the Metropolitan Church in Cairo. During the vacancy caused by the death of the late Coptic patriarch, the Khedive, there is no doubt, placed great obstacles in the way of the election of his successor, but this was probably the result rather of a curious superstition than of religious bigotry.

And now, if it would seem that the independence of the ruler of Egypt would but aggravate and intensify present evils, is there no remedy for the state of things depicted in the foregoing pages?—a state which has indeed been painted in too faint instead of in too dark colours. When there is a uniform dead-level of continual cruelty,

rapacity, and injustice, it is hard to select particular instances, and those already advanced do but exemplify the common, every-day state of affairs. For myself I cannot agree with the sentiment of Mr. Freeman—and it is the only one in his article in this Review (Dec. 1875) to which I cannot heartily subscribe—when he says that he cannot quarrel with Moslem tyrants in respect of this treatment of their Mohammedan subjects. Surely we need not so limit our sympathies, but should be ready when occasion offers to help all. And assuredly a great cry for justice rises up before Heaven from Egypt. Might not we Englishmen hope that by unseating the present alien despot and by occupying at least a portion of Egypt, we could give to the Arab inhabitants that meed of justice, which spite of the individual shortcomings of new-fledged Scotch civilians and English subalterns we have in the main given to India? In that occupation lies, I am persuaded, the sole hope of Egypt. As a rule I am opposed to further annexations of territory. I believe that empires, like Russia and the United States, may be too large for the happiness and liberty of the people, but in respect to Egypt I am convinced that the occupation of the country, so far at least as the Delta, Cairo, and some portion of the higher Nile valley is concerned, is imposed upon us both by political necessity and by duty. By political necessity; because now that Englishmen have begun to find out that the Bosphorus is not on the direct road to India, and now that the Sick Man's constitution seems to be finally breaking up, it becomes of paramount importance to British interests to possess the true approach to our Indian possessions and to have the command of the great highway in which we have just acquired so large an interest. And next, by duty; because we should then break the chains of slavery and open the doors of the house of bondage, and give freedom, justice, and protection to an honest and faithful people who are now groaning under a foreign yoke. The most zealous sticklers for the doctrine that possession and prescription sanctify tyranny and usurpation are unable to pretend that the family of Mohammed Ali have any right to the Arabian country which they misrule.

GREVILLE J. CHESTER.

## ON MR. MILL'S THEORY OF VALUE.

It has often been noted that what a man writes in condemnation of the opinions of another is open to all the sources of error that affect his work when he expounds his own opinions, and to others in addition: for he may have failed rightly to track the thoughts which he believes himself to be criticising. When a truth assumes great importance for a man and he sees it clearly, he will make others see it clearly; he will be trustworthy so long as he writes of it constructively. But, though he may be wholly superior to the temptation so to lower the reputation of previous writers that his own may be the more eminent, his devotion to the truth which is dominant in his own mind will be apt not only to render him jealous of the position of complementary truths, but so far to pre-occupy his thoughts as to hinder him from perceiving all that these truths have worked in the minds of others. It is not, therefore, an unhealthy sign of the times that a series of attacks has been made by various writers on various sides of the central doctrine of the book by which most living English economists have been educated; and it is not a matter of wonder that some of these attacks have been made by thinkers of great power. It may be possible without detracting from the worth of what they have contributed towards the construction of the theory of Value, to show that many of their destructive criticisms are due to their not having perceived the full power, which is latent, if not patent, in Mill's work. If this can be effected, some energy which is now consumed in quarrels in the economists' camp, may be turned to use in the common cause, and do good service against error. The aim of the present article is to indicate in outline Mill's position, so as to display its strength. I shall refer in footnotes to some criticisms on Mill contained in a work by Professor Cairnes.<sup>1</sup> His already well-earned reputation, the soundness of his judgment, the lucidity and grace of his style, the tact and skill with which he has brought out clearly defined results, have combined to render that work extremely popular. Although Cairnes may be regarded as one of Mill's most distinguished disciples, yet a considerable portion of his book is devoted to a new exposition of some principles which he apparently thought had not been adequately appreciated or stated with sufficient accuracy by Mill. These points of difference between the two writers have been seized upon with avidity by an influential set of men, who, by the recent publication of Mill's Autobiography, had been put

(1) "Some leading Principles of Political Economy."



in a mood to regard Mill as a slighter man than they had thought him before. I believe that in most instances in which Mill's doctrines have been criticised by Cairnes, and by other writers, Mill is substantially right. I also think that Cairnes considered that the difference between himself and Mill is greater than it really is. The better class of readers used to puzzle over a difficult passage of Mill's till they got to see, more or less, its whole drift. Now such readers readily adopt Cairnes' authoritative suggestion, that it contains a blunder: they see distinctly that half of the truth which Cairnes has written out for them in a bold, clear hand; they do not trouble themselves to hunt out that more recondite half, to which Mill was, as it seems to me, working his way, but with which Cairnes has not concerned himself. There is no doubt that Cairnes was a genuinely sincere friend of Mill and truth. I am grateful for the services he has rendered to Economics: I cannot express that gratitude better than by unflinchingly pointing out cases in which he seems to me not to have got hold of the whole of Mill's meaning.

A critic of Mill's writings may not ignore the following facts. In the small leisure that was left to him free from official work, Mill wrote on a wide variety of questions, which had already been discussed by great thinkers. On almost every one of these questions his thoughts, whatever faults they contained, were in some respect new. Therefore he had not much time for elaborating the explanation of his thoughts. His style was that of a man having great power of exposition; but in one respect this power injured him. For it caused men to assume that whatever error appeared in his writings was due not to imperfect presentation of clear thought, but to perfect presentation of confused thought. They have overlooked the fact that this power could not avail him for the task of drilling a large body of thoughts into such order that they should in all their movements present a clear front to the reader. For this task time alone avails.

In writing his Political Economy he laboured under special disadvantages. He wished to compress into it a vast amount of matter; but his style is so easeful as to incite his readers to overmuch rapidity. Hence it occurs that he is frequently charged not only with omitting truths of which he has taken account, but even with holding erroneous doctrines which he has in due place demolished, and thereafter ignored. He did not even consider himself at liberty to select his terms freely: he feared to weight the science, which was not then popular, with the burden of technical terms. Moreover he was finely jealous for his predecessors: he gave not only to Ricardo, but, in opposition to the current of the time, to Adam Smith whatever credit he could. Nearly all of those phrases of his

which are unfortunate, are phrases of theirs which he has been unwilling to discard. Thus he has been induced to retain the use of some expressions which he has affirmed to be neither sufficiently flexible nor sufficiently firm for the proper purposes of science.

Those, then, who wish rightly to construe any of Mill's economic doctrines, must learn the special part which he intended that doctrine to perform, to the end that they may not demand from it the discharge of functions which he has assigned to some other portion of his system; and they must remember that he is not always careful to repeat an indication that he has once given of the special application which he intends to make of a word or a phrase in a particular discussion. They must, therefore, consider each passage in connection with its context; and when its interpretation cannot by this means be conclusively settled, they must with generous caution reject any rendering of it which is inconsistent with the general purport of his writings. Readers who will observe these rules may find in Mill's economic doctrines much exposition that requires to be supplemented, and many abrupt lines of thought which require to be continued. But they will find that it is true of his thought, as of Adam Smith's, that much even of the work which most invites the attack of the destructive critic is, in the main, sound as far as it goes. This is, as it appears to me, the case with his account of value.

It was known, even before the publication of his Autobiography, that Mill regarded, as perhaps the chief of the services which he had rendered to economics, his work in breaking up and re-arranging its chief problems; and, though experience may have shown that in some details his arrangement is not wholly successful, we are bound to take account of the important truth which the general plan of his arrangement embodies.

This plan was, in separate books, firstly to treat the nature of human efforts, and the laws of the production of wealth generally; secondly, the distribution of wealth; and thirdly, to devote a book exclusively to "the machinery of exchange." His first book is mainly concerned with the causes which affect generally the efficiency of labour in production. The analysis contained here enables him, when he treats of exchange value, to dismiss this aspect of cost of production with a reference to his first book; and the curt statement, "What the production of a thing costs to its producers, or its series of producers, is the labour expended in producing it."<sup>1</sup> In his second book he develops Adam Smith's grand doctrine, which shows how the distribution of wealth would be effected "naturally," *i.e.* as the average result of free competition operating through many

(1) Bk. III., Ch. IV., § 1. Attention may be directed to the extensions of this analysis in Hearn's "Plutology," and in Jevons' "Theory of Political Economy."

generations. This distribution would be such that the wages which a man receives would vary, according to certain laws, with the efforts and sacrifices demanded from him, conjointly with the efforts and sacrifices which his special education demanded from his parents and others; and that thus the remuneration of each task would in a manner measure the efforts it had cost to society as a whole, or rather to those members of society who, directly or indirectly, had contributed to its performance. Mill explains the artificial hindrances to this correspondence between the remuneration of various tasks and their total effort-costs. He shows how these hindrances are due not only to formal trade regulations, but also to the special difficulties against which parents in the various grades of society have to contend, if they desire to secure high wages to their sons in the future, at the expense of a present sacrifice to themselves. He points out that, roughly speaking, English labour falls into four "different grades," between which "the line of demarcation has hitherto been so strongly marked as to be almost equivalent to a hereditary distinction of caste; each employment being chiefly recruited from the children of those already employed in it, or of employments of the same rank with it in social estimation, or from the children of persons who, if originally of a lower rank, have succeeded in raising themselves by their exertions."<sup>1</sup> These four grades are:—i. the liberal professions; ii. the more highly-skilled manual employments; iii. the lower classes of skilled employments; iv. unskilled labourers. Labourers of the second grade are partly supplied from "the class of tradesmen who rank with them;" so are those of the third. "The wages of each class have been hitherto regulated by the increase of its own population." But "the general relaxation of conventional barriers, and the increased facilities which already are, and will be in a much greater degree, brought within the reach of all, tend to produce, among many excellent effects, one which is the reverse: they tend to bring down the wages of skilled labour." Mill is so far from ignoring "conventional barriers," that he regards it as his special task to insist that the "arrangements" which were due to them be distinguished from the "natural laws" of political economy; and enforces this distinction by the arrangement of his work. In a similar strain he continues Adam Smith's account of profits.<sup>2</sup> And after indicating how the ele-

(1) Bk. II., Ch. XIV. Cairnes has done good service by insisting on this fact. Mill's account is complete, but too terse. Few persons have any more notion than Cairnes had that his far-famed account of the four grades of labour had been anticipated not only in outline, but in detail by Mill.

(2) The drift of part of his argument on this point might be made clearer by building in some material from the fourth of his important, but neglected, "Essays on Unsettled Questions of Political Economy." Though it is a digression, I may venture to remark that his treatment of the influence which the distribution of wealth exerts on the accumulation of capital is one of the weakest portions of his

ment of rent may in general be eliminated from the problems of the third book, he concludes the second book with the statement that the discussion of the subject with which it deals will be taken up again in the fourth book, and that he will interpolate "a separate book" devoted to "the instrumentality by which, in a civilised society, the distribution is effected—the machinery of exchange and price." This statement is repeated and dwelt upon in the introduction to his third book, and it appears to me to be sufficiently emphatic; but additional emphasis has recently been given to it, in so far at least as it refers to the special functions of the second book, by the account of the tone of his treatise on political economy, which occurs in his *Autobiography*. He there speaks of—

"That general tone by which it is distinguished from all previous expositions of political economy that had any pretension to be scientific, and which made it so useful in conciliating minds which those previous expositions had repelled. This tone consisted chiefly in making the proper distinction between the laws of the production of wealth, which are real laws of nature, dependent on the properties of objects, and the modes of its distribution, which, subject to certain conditions, depend on human will. The common run of political economists confuse these together, under the designation of economic laws, which they deem incapable of being defeated or modified by human effort; ascribing the same necessity to things dependent on the unchangeable conditions of our earthly existence, and to those which, being but the necessary consequences of particular social arrangements, are merely co-extensive with those: given certain institutions and customs, wages, profits, and rent will be determined by certain causes; but this class of political economists drop the indispensable presupposition, and argue that these causes must, by an inherent necessity, against which no human means can avail, determine the shares which fall in the division of the produce to labourers, capitalists, and landlords. The 'Principles of Political Economy' yielded to none of its predecessors in aiming at the scientific appreciation of the action of these causes under the conditions which they presuppose; but it set the example of not regarding those conditions as final. The economic generalizations which depend, not on necessities of nature, but on those combined with the existing arrangements of

system, even if account be taken of his essay (*Fortnightly Review*, vol. v., N.S., p. 515) to introduce into his old theory of the wages-fund, "the qualifications and limitations necessary to make it admissible." Scant justice has been done to the arguments by which Mill supports the position that, partly on account of its being badly formulated, this doctrine gave countenance to the notion that the distribution of the produce of industry between capitalists and wage-receivers is governed by a "natural" and "immutable law," and is not capable of being modified by a readjustment of "the arrangements of society." He does not argue that any action such as that of trades unions can suddenly cause a *great* change in these arrangements, or the consequent distribution of wealth; he contends merely that the claims of trades unions to make a change must be discussed freely; they are not to be ruled out of court without a hearing, as condemned by a "natural law." Much work must be done before we even approach a solution of the difficulties which Mill here indicates. Some of his critics, including Professor Cairnes, ignore these difficulties, and quote against him principles which underlie his reasonings throughout his treatise (see not only Bk. II., Chap. xi., but also Bk. I., chs. v., vi., and xi.; Bk. II., ch. xv.; Bk. IV., chs. iv., vi). The simple suggestion has been publicly made that in his later years he may have forgotten these elementary principles.

society, it deals with as only provisional, and as liable to be much altered by the progress of social improvement."<sup>1</sup>

Thus (i.) natural laws determine the total stock of the material wealth or material sources of enjoyment, which will at any stage of progress be produced at the total cost of given human efforts and sacrifices: (ii.) the "human will" and "particular social arrangements"<sup>2</sup> determine the scheme according to which remuneration shall be distributed out of this total sum to each class of efforts and sacrifices: (iii.) this distribution is effected by the instrumentality of a "machinery of exchange," the greater part of which would be put in requisition under almost any social arrangements that are likely to exist in the civilised world. The science of this machinery is the proper province of "pure" or "abstract" economic investigations.

If it be given that a bottle of wine and a pound of tea can be disposed of for the same price in the same open market at a given period, the gratifications of the purchasers in this market at this time due to the bottle of wine and the pound of tea, have this price as their common exchange measure; and the machinery of exchange is not concerned with any other of their properties. If it be given that twenty minutes' work by a physician, or two days' work by a watchmaker, or four days' work by a carpenter, or a fortnight's work by an agricultural labourer, can be bought in a given market at the same time for a guinea, and that the sacrifice involved in the loan of twenty guineas for a year can be bought by a guinea, then these several efforts and this abstinence are equivalent to one another for the purposes of the machinery of exchange working in that market at that time. These data being given, the machinery takes no further account of the pleasures or pains concerned. A chemist's balance takes no account of the medical properties of an ounce of arsenic, but the chemist does. Mill in due place takes account of the fatigue due to the work of the watchmaker and the carpenter; but the machinery treated of in his third book does not.<sup>3</sup> Wherever the phrase "a ratio between the costs of production of two commodities" occurs, cost of production cannot mean the aggregate of the diverse efforts and abstinences that have been required for the production of the commodity. Mill was aware, though some of his critics forget,

(1) Mill's "Autobiography," pp. 246-7. Cairnes appears to me not to take sufficient account of the general plan of Mill's work. He takes no account of the vital importance which Mill found in the distinction between the human habits by which freedom of competition between various classes of labours is controlled, and the mechanical agencies by which exchanges are effected. Many of his criticisms almost imply that Mill's third book claims to be a complete treatise on Economics.

(2) This phrase occurs not only in the above passage, but also in the "Political Economy" (Bk. III., ch. i., § 1).

(3) Professor Cairnes implies (p. 76) that the law of cost of production is subject in this connexion to an important limitation which Mill has overlooked. Here again he seems not to have noticed the relation in which Mill's second book stands to his third.

that one aggregate of diverse efforts and abstinences does not bear a ratio to another. When we speak of ratio between an effort and an abstinence, or even between two diverse efforts, we assume, *ipso facto*, an artificial mode of measuring them in terms of some common unit, and refer to the ratio between their measures. The pure science of Ethics halts for lack of a system of measurement of efforts, sacrifices, desires, &c., fit for her wide purposes. But the pure science of Political Economy has found a system that will subserve her narrower aims. This discovery, rather than any particular proposition, is the great fact of the pure science.

It has been remarked that, in general, the truths by the discovery of which epochs in history have been made have been simple truths. An epoch has been created not by a new doctrine, but by the acquisition of the point of view from which the doctrine proceeded. A point of view was conquered for us by Adam Smith, from which a commodity is regarded as the embodiment of measurable efforts and sacrifices. Whosoever will put himself at this point of view may, with ease, see through fallacies which clouded the vision of statesmen not only of ancient times, but of an age that had gained the right point of view for the corresponding physical problem of the laws of motion of material masses.

Proceeding from its new point of view, Political Economy has analysed the efforts and sacrifices that are required for the production of a commodity for a given market at a given time; she has found a measure for them in their *cost to the person who will purchase them*, and then enunciated her central truth. This central truth is that producers, each governed under the sway of free competition by calculations of his own interest, will endeavour so to regulate the amount of any commodity which is produced for a given market during a given period, that this amount shall be just capable on the average of finding purchasers during this period at a remunerative price: a remunerative price being defined to be a price which shall be just equal to the sum of the exchange measures of those efforts and sacrifices which are required for the production of the commodity when this particular amount is produced, *i.e.*, to the sum of the expenses which must be incurred by a person who would purchase the performance of these efforts and sacrifices. Mill has retained the usage which applies to this sum the name "cost of production," without further explanation than is supplied by the context. I do not maintain that no advantage would have been gained if Mill had invented some new term for this sum, say "expenses of production," and had used the term "cost of production" only when he was speaking of efforts and sacrifices as they affected those who underwent them. I may concede that recent experience strengthens the arguments in favour of such a change, and I propose to say, in future, that the exchange-values of two com-

modities tend to bear to one another the same ratio as their *expenses of production*. But I maintain that when a ratio between costs of production is spoken of in the first chapters of Mill's third book, a misinterpretation, by which cost is referred to efforts instead of to measures of effort, is as inexcusable as one by which a traveller in New York or Nova Scotia should assume that allusions to *The Times*, or to *Halifax*, refer to *The Times* of London or the *Halifax* of Yorkshire. For besides guarding against such a misinterpretation implicitly, Mill puts a brief but clear warning against it into the most prominent place he could have chosen—the commencement of his chapter on the Analysis of Cost of Production. There, as I have said, he starts by an allusion to the fact that his treatment of labour *quâ* effort is to be found in his first book, and then says, "What the production of a thing costs to its producer, or its series of producers, is the labour expended in producing it."<sup>1</sup>

The form into which I have thrown Mill's account of the relative values of commodities produced freely in the same country is chosen in order to make manifest the continuity that exists between this and other portions of his theory of value. Some persons fail to see that his "Law of Cost of Production" is regarded by him as operative only as a result of, or corollary from, the law according to which the action of the producers of a commodity is governed by their calculations of the circumstances of the future supply and demand in the market. He explains this briefly, perhaps too briefly, at the beginning of the third book of his *Political Economy*, and again in the following sentence:<sup>2</sup>—"The influence even of cost of production depends on supply; for the only thing which compels price, on the average, to conform to cost of production, is that if the price is either above or below that standard, it is brought back to it either by an increase or a diminution of the supply." The true nature of this doctrine would have been more manifest had not Mill, after Ricardo, judged it important to use terms that should bring into prominence the properties which distinguished rather than the properties which united the various propositions of the theory of value. The charges of inconsistency and confusion which have been brought against his account, as it now stands, by writers as learned as Mr. McLeod, and as powerful as Professor Jevons, establish, I think, conclusively, that his position would have been improved if he had adopted the other alternative. I propose, then, to speak of the form of exposition of Mill's central doctrine, which I have given on the preceding page, as the "Law of Free Production and Average Demand" (the word free

(1) Professor Cairnes (p. 50), after quoting a long passage from Mill, in which this sentence occurs, states that "the conception of cost which it suggests is radically unsound, confounding things in their own nature distinct and even antithetical, and setting in an essentially false light the incidents of production and exchange."

(2) *Fortnightly Review*, vol. v., N.S., p. 507.

being introduced in order to indicate that the law does not hold for the produce of a monopoly); and to speak of Mill's Laws of Cost of Production<sup>1</sup> (or as I should now say, "Expenses of Production") as corollaries from it.

One advantage of this mode of stating Mill's doctrine would be that it would render more clear his use of the terms "supply" and "demand." The circumstances of a market determine the particular exchange value, the expectation of which will suffice to induce producers to supply on the average any particular amount of a given commodity during a given period. These circumstances determine also the particular exchange value which will induce purchasers to demand on the average any particular amount of it during this period; the demand of each person being dependent upon<sup>2</sup> his means and the value in use to him of the commodity. Thus we must "mean by the word demand the quantity demanded, and remember that this is not a fixed quantity, but in general varies according to the value."<sup>3</sup> Although Mill puts this statement in the most prominent place possible, and repeats it, some of his critics have not seen its full force.<sup>4</sup> Thus we are to regard the average exchange value as under normal circumstances equating supply and demand; in this sense, that the circumstances of the market being supposed to be approximately uniform, the average exchange value will be such that the expectation of their obtaining this value for their commodity will cause producers on the average to supply just that amount which consumers are, on the average, just willing to purchase at that exchange value.

I do not think that Mill made his decision lightly when he determined in his theory of values "in an isolated country," to measure the transaction which he describes in terms of the quantity

(1) Mill, Bk. III., ch. iv., paragraphs xiii. and xiv. Mr. Carey proposes to say that the value of a commodity is equal to its cost of *reproduction*. He would thus avoid many small difficulties, but he would do serious mischief by diverting attention from the forces which govern supply in the first instance and value in the second.

(2) In mathematical language "a function of." I hold that much of what Professor Jevons says about "final utility" is contained, implicitly, at least, in Mill's account: but he has brought out with excellent distinctness many vital points connected with this notion, and has thereby made one of the most important of recent contributions to Economics.

(3) Mill, Bk. III., ch. ii., § 4.

(4) This is a striking instance in which Cairnes presents his readers with one portion only of Mill's account. He says (p. 23), "Demand as there" [*i.e.* in the chapter from which I quote] "defined, is to be understood as measured, not, as my definition would require, by the quantity of purchasing power offered in support of the desire for commodities, but by the quantity of commodities for which such purchasing power is offered." He does not notice that Mill insists that the quantity demanded "varies according to the value." There is a great difference between the statements, "I will buy twelve eggs," and "I will buy a shilling's worth of eggs." But there is no substantive difference between the statement "I will buy twelve eggs at a penny each, but only six at three halfpence each," and the statement "I will expend a shilling on eggs at a penny each, but if they cost three halfpence each I will spend ninepence on them."



of the commodity in question.<sup>1</sup> Some years ago, under the influence of Cournot's thought,<sup>2</sup> I spent a long time in experimenting with various modes of expression for this theory, and for the theory of international values. I found that for the more elementary problems of either theory, almost any mode of expression would answer: but that for the more complex problems, that mode of expression which Mill has selected in the former theory, is the best adapted for it, and that which he has selected for the latter theory is the best adapted for it; and the experience of others who have concerned themselves with quantitative analysis, tends, as far as I can gather, in the same direction.<sup>3</sup>

We must, of course, always bear in mind the fundamental truth, that, to use Mill's words, that "which constitutes the means of payment for commodities . . . is simply commodities. Each person's means of paying for the productions of other people consists of those which he himself possesses. All sellers are inevitably, and by the meaning of the word, buyers. Could we suddenly double the productive powers of the country, we should double the supply of commodities in every market: but we should by the same stroke double the purchasing power. Everybody would bring a double demand as well as supply:"<sup>4</sup> that is to say, the amount of each commodity which each person would be willing to purchase at a given exchange value would in general be doubled; and the amount which each producer of the commodity would be willing to supply at a given exchange value would be doubled.

Exactly corresponding is his account of market value. The amount which dealers offer for sale at any particular value is governed by their calculations of the present and future conditions of the markets with which they are directly and indirectly connected. There are some offers which none of them would accept: some offers which none of them would refuse. But those who can least afford to wait, and those whose expectation of the future condition of the market are the least sanguine, will just be induced to accept offers which others will just refuse. There is a particular exchange value at which each particular amount will be offered for sale, a particular value at which each particular amount can find purchasers. The higgling and the bargaining of the market tend to force the exchange value to that position which will just equate

(1) As mathematicians would say, to select this quantity for his independent variable.

(2) "*Recherches sur les Principes Mathematiques de la Theorie des Richesses*," Paris, 1838.

(3) This is one of many instances in which Professor Cairnes might, I think, have appreciated Ricardo's and Mill's work more truly if he had not given his chief attention to qualitative analysis, to the neglect of quantitative analysis.

(4) Bk. III., chap. xiv., § 2. Professor Cairnes insists upon this truth *e.g.* p. 27. But he has not observed that a recognition of it governs the whole course of Mill's reasonings.

supply and demand: *i.e.*, to make the exchange value such that the amount which dealers are willing to sell at that value, is equal to the amount which can find purchasers at that value.

It is true that Mill does not explain this carefully in his *Political Economy*. The theory of market values was considered by economists as of slight importance, until Mr. Thornton's book *On Labour* appeared. Mr. Thornton's work is not free from faults; but he has not received his due meed of gratitude for having led men to a point of view from which the practical importance of the theory of market values is clearly seen. In particular he led Mill to give an exposition of his views on the subject.<sup>1</sup>

Mill, following Adam Smith, insisted on the doctrine, that fluctuations of the market price, above and below the average price, are injurious to the community.<sup>2</sup> Some of the subtlest arguments for and against "protection to native industry," turn on the principles involved in these doctrines; but such arguments have not, as far as I am aware, received attention in this country.

A few words may be said on Mill's use of "cost of production" in his theory of international values. It has been argued above that when he speaks of the machinery of exchange as causing the values of commodities freely produced at home to bear to one another on the average the ratio of their costs of production, it would be certain, even without the explanation which he supplies, that he is speaking not of the efforts and sacrifices that were required for the production of the several commodities, but of their exchange measures. The pure theory of international values is based on the hypothesis, that there is no migration of labour or capital from one country to another, and that therefore there exist no artificial and precise common measures of efforts, and sacrifices undergone in different countries. Therefore the machinery of exchange knows nothing of any comparison between the costs of production of commodities produced in different countries. When, therefore, Mill makes any sort of comparison between such costs, we may be certain (1) that he is speaking of the efforts and sacrifices themselves, and not of their measures, and (2) that he is not professing to make an exact quantitative statement. And this is the fact.<sup>3</sup> He repeats indeed from Ricardo the remark that, on the hypothesis that capital and labour do not circulate freely

(1) I am unable to conjecture how Cairnes has managed so to misinterpret him as to make the startling statement (p. 117), "We desire to know the circumstances which determine price; and we are told that the selling price is always such that the quantity of a commodity purchased in a given market is equal to the quantity sold in that market. The statement is incontrovertible, but I fail to see how it helps us to understand the facts."

(2) What Professor Cairnes says on this subject (pp. 123, &c.) appears to me to be in substance true, as far as it goes, and important. But he seems to me again to have overlooked some of the work of his predecessors.

(3) Cairnes appears not to have noticed this: hence he charges Mill with grave inconsistencies.

between countries, a commodity may exchange for another produced in a different country, though the efforts and sacrifices involved in the production of the one, have been much greater than those involved for the other; and the remark that a commodity may be systematically imported into a country which has greater natural facilities for producing it than are possessed by the country from which it is obtained. But these are merely negative statements: they are not constituent portions of the theory. The functions which they discharge do not require that the terms in which they are expressed should be capable of precise quantitative interpretation. We have not to decide what is the number of sugar-canes the labour of cutting which under a tropical sun is to be regarded as equivalent to that of getting a ton of iron ore, in order that we may be able to assent to the proposition that the production of the sugar we obtain in exchange for our iron, *may not* have cost just as much labour as the production of the iron did, but may have cost either more or less labour. Whenever, in the constructive portions of the theory, mention is made of a ratio between costs of production, reference is had to two commodities produced freely in the same country; the machinery of exchange is exhibited as weighing the expenses of production, as I propose to say, of the two commodities. It is true, doubtless, that Mill has not guarded against mistaken renderings of his words with sufficient fulness of iteration, but what he has written suffices logically to exclude false renderings; and there are few thoughtful students who fail to perceive the main drift of his reasonings.<sup>1</sup>

There is much to be said of the manner in which the pure theory of values in an isolated country, and the pure theory of international values are intended to supplement each other in Mill's system; the powers of the two theories being combined for the solution of problems relating to the trade, that is actually carried on between (say) two different sets of people in England, or between England and America. But I must content myself here with calling attention to the hints and the facts bearing on this subject that are contained in Mr. Cliffe Leslie's eminently instructive and suggestive writings on wages and prices.

ALFRED MARSHALL.

(1) Great as is the value of Professor Cairnes's constructive and explanatory remarks on this subject, he does not seem to me to have fully entered into Mill's position. For instance, when speaking of the American protectionists, he says (p. 57), "they ask, how can we, with our high-priced labour, compete with the pauper labour of Europe? I must frankly own that, accepting the point of view of the current theory of cost, I can find no satisfactory reply to this question." Mill's answer is, of course, that if American producers generally should be unable to compete with English producers at the present rates of wages, a flow of gold (Cairnes here regards wages in America as measured in gold) from America to England would set in; by which ultimately a general fall in the prices of labour and commodities in America would be effected, until American producers gained possession of the market with regard to those commodities, in the production of which they are at the greatest advantage or the least disadvantage.

## MADAME DE MAINTENON.<sup>1</sup>

THE law of the old French monarchy which excluded women from direct inheritance of the throne, by no means excluded them from great and often paramount influence in affairs of State. Indeed it would not be difficult to show that in few European countries has female authority been more frequent and predominant than in the country which boasted the Salic law. Whether as indigenous mistresses or imported queens, women shaped the policy and wielded the power of the French kings to a degree which could not be easily

(1) A singular ill fortune has attended Madame de Maintenon's literary remains. The task of publishing her letters in the first instance fell into the hands of an adventurer of some talent and more impudence—Laurent Angliviel de la Beaumelle. His edition, several times reprinted in the eighteenth century, has been accepted as fairly trustworthy down to recent times; the more so as he was known to have been assisted by the ladies of St. Cyr, who furnished him with valuable original documents. It now appears that his edition teems with forgeries of the most flagitious kind. He not only tampered with the text of genuine letters, often actually re-writing them and interpolating fraudulent additions of his own, but he forged whole letters by the dozen whenever unwelcome gaps in the authentic correspondence suggested or permitted the deception. The almost incredible extent of his imposture was only exposed when the late M. Théophile Lavallée commenced his edition of Madame de Maintenon's General correspondence. M. Lavallée had himself been a dupe, like all preceding writers, of La Beaumelle's mendacity. About twenty years ago the need of a new and critical edition of Madame de Maintenon's letters and other works was much felt, and two editors devoted themselves to the task, independently and in ignorance of each other's labours, the Duc de Noailles and M. Lavallée. M. Guizot brought them into communication, and M. Lavallée was charged with the whole undertaking. Unhappily, he has died before completing his task, only four volumes having appeared of his edition of the Letters, which was intended to comprise ten.

M. Lavallée had a *culte* for Madame de Maintenon, and his work, extending over twelve years, devoted to her memory, was truly a labour of love. He disinterred autograph letters, whenever they had been preserved, and accepted only such copies as were guaranteed by being transcriptions from the originals made by the ladies of St. Cyr. It was on confronting these authentic documents with La Beaumelle's edition that the magnitude of the latter's fraud was first brought fully to light. It is not too much to say that Madame de Maintenon has been hitherto chiefly known and painted on the faith of this unscrupulous inventor. Even the best and most recent books are filled with his fabrications; e.g., Henri Martin, in his elaborate and painstaking "History of France," quotes almost exclusively the apocryphal letters; expressions as familiar as household words, supposed to be Madame de Maintenon's, are now proved to be fictions of La Beaumelle's. For instance, the famous sentences, "Je le renvoie toujours affligé, jamais désespéré," "Cela m'engage à approuver des choses fort opposées à mes sentiments," etc., etc., are not Madame de Maintenon's at all, though it is difficult to banish them from the mind. As M. Lavallée says, it will take a long time before the false impression created by La Beaumelle's imposture is dispelled, if it ever is entirely.

Of course, we have to take M. Lavallée's word for these statements. But I believe his honourable character has never been doubted, and his work proves him to have been a most painstaking and well-informed editor. When I quote Madame de Maintenon's letters, it is to his edition I refer, except when otherwise indicated.

matched in any other royal house of Europe. During considerable periods of French history the titular king is a shadow, and the foreground of politics is occupied by a vigorous queen (regent or consort), or an ambitious concubine. From Blanche of Castille and Agnes Sorel, to Madame de Pompadour and Marie Antoinette, French politics repeatedly fell into feminine hands. The result was not often fortunate for France. Although that country has perhaps produced as many eminent women as the rest of Europe put together, it has not been happy in its female rulers. We look in vain through its annals for any woman on or near the throne that can be compared with Isabella of Spain, Elizabeth of England, or Maria Theresa of Austria. The most beautiful and lofty female character, in all history, does indeed belong to French politics; but the incomparable maid of Domremy was far from any legitimate or illegitimate connection with the throne. In all despotic monarchies the too frequent accident of a weak and uxorious prince leads naturally to the domination of intriguing women and courtly parasites. The foreign queens, or the beauties of native growth who supplant them, have rarely much inducement to make a magnanimous use of their power. That women are capable in a high degree of the sentiment of patriotism, will be denied only by the uncandid or the ignorant. But the Salic law excluded from Government precisely those women who by birth and education would have been most likely to be inspired by that noble passion. Anne de Beaujeu showed that a French king's daughter could be far more worthy to bear rule than her brother, the king's son. There were imperial qualities in la Grande Mademoiselle, which might make us wish that her lofty, if also somewhat fantastic daring, had found a fitter theatre than the grotesque tragi-comedy of the Fronde.

Among the women who have left a lasting name and mark in French history, Madame de Maintenon undoubtedly holds a prominent, if not a chief place. The length of her reign, and the durability of her influence are without parallel. As Louis XIV. reigned longer than any other king of France, so Madame de Maintenon occupied the position of chief favourite for a longer period than any one before or after her. Her extraordinary career, during which she travelled from the lowest depths of poverty and obscurity to the loftiest place but one in Europe, has struck the imagination and curiosity, both of contemporaries and posterity. Her exalted, but to the end ambiguous position, had the same effect, and contributed to endow her with that air of mystery of which few minds escape the fascination. She herself said 'she should be an enigma to posterity, and she seems rather to have liked the reflection than otherwise. The object at once of unbounded adulation and unscrupulous calumny, reserved and self-contained to the verge of

duplicity, she has left a reputation which to this day remains in the half-light which partakes of legend. Two legends concerning her had commenced before her death, one highly flattering, the other as hostile. According to one, she was an apparition wellnigh or quite miraculous, a sort of courtly Joan of Arc, divinely appointed to convert a licentious king from his immoral ways; according to the other, she was a miracle of crafty intrigue, who, with a subtlety hardly human, had bewitched an aged monarch into humiliating subjection to her. We are not reduced to a random guess that the truth probably lies between these two extremes: Enough remains in her own handwriting (though it is conjectured that she destroyed nine-tenths of her correspondence) to show us that she was equally removed from the angelic character, whether dark or light. The pretension of her unreserved admirers, past and present, that all her actions were inspired by a pure and lofty piety, that she submitted for years to a court life of hot intrigue in a company the least virtuous from motives of perfect virtue, can only be met by a smile. The pretension of her unreserved enemies, that she with forecasting insight played, without conscience or scruple, her deep game of hypocrisy and ambition for the sake of worldly honour, can only be met in the same way. Madame de Maintenon in this respect has only received the common measure of justice and injustice which usually falls to those who attain extraordinary preeminence after starting from relatively lowly beginnings. The ambitious climber to the giddy height is credited with a profound plan of operations from the first, with a distinct view of the distant goal ultimately reached, but designed all along, and with the artifice and cunning needed to secure the stages which led to it. The end of the career is supposed to explain its commencement. The earliest steps were taken in reference to the path along which the last were meant to fall. It is thus that Cæsar is supposed to have set out to conquer Gaul with the settled intention of conquering the Senate afterwards, and Cromwell to have entered the Long Parliament with the matured purpose of bringing Charles I. to the scaffold. Such conceptions are wanting in imaginative grasp and reality. They suppose that human life can be written out like a well-conned play, and that the dim future years can be seen through and fitted with appropriate stage directions. Inapplicable to the most audacious and inventive schemers for power, this notion is peculiarly misplaced with regard to Madame de Maintenon. Few of her equals in ability and force of character have had so little ideal lift of spirit, or of an eye far-reaching, and bent on distant horizons. Less than most was she given to building castles in the air, or to regarding as present what still lay hidden in the womb of the future. On the contrary, her success and her strength lay in her complete sobriety of temper, and

a patience that could not be wearied. If she could have foreseen her career it is probable she would never have attempted it. Not soaring genius, but consummate common sense was her quality. It was far less ambition than the most watchful prudence that directed her steps, and both prudence and common sense would have dissuaded her from a path which she ultimately trod without a fall.

Frances d'Aubigné, afterwards Madame Scarron and Marquise de Maintenon, came of an ancient family originally from Anjou. None of her ancestors were distinguished except her grandfather, the famous Agrippa d'Aubigné, the friend and companion in arms of Henry IV., and one of the most strenuous and original characters of the sixteenth century. One of the fathers of French prose and a copious writer of vigorous verse, he was also one of the most fierce and intrepid warriors of that wild time. He was presented to Henry as a man "who found nothing too hot for him," and he proved the correctness of the character abundantly, especially by saving Henry's life at the risk of his own. The valiant old Huguenot had a most unworthy son named Constant d'Aubigné, a depraved and feeble libertine, who was twice saved from the gallows by his father's influence. But the foolish creature, not content with spending his substance, and committing rape and murder, conspired against Cardinal Richelieu, for which he was imprisoned for many years, and only released by the Cardinal's death. Constant had for second wife (he had killed his first) Jeanne de Cardilhac, a brave woman, but soured by her trials and domestic unhappiness. She went to share her scandalous husband's prison at Niort, and there, in the extreme of privation, she gave birth, 27th November, 1635, to a girl, who afterwards became Madame de Maintenon.<sup>1</sup>

Frances had a wretched childhood, the gloom and misery of which were never effaced from her mind. Her mother went to Paris, and lived there in extreme poverty, in pursuit of hopeless lawsuits. Her abandoned father persevered in his vices. Her early years were tended by a paternal aunt, Madame de Villette, for whom, to the end of her life, she retained the most affectionate memory. At length a brighter prospect seemed to open before the unfortunate family. The French of the seventeenth century were not so unable or unwilling to emigrate as they have since become, and Constant d'Aubigné, now sixty years old, solicited and obtained the post of Governor of Marie-Galante, situate in Martinique. The exiles sailed a family of five, the father, mother, two boys, and a girl, the latter, Frances, not quite ten years old. On the voyage Frances sickened even unto apparent death. She was about to be buried in the sea, when her mother insisted on once more seeing her child,

(1) "*La famille d'Aubigné et l'enfance de Madame de Maintenon*," p. 77, par Théophile Lavallée.

and finding the heart's action had not stopped, she declared that her daughter was not dead, and saved her from the deep. It was a narrow escape. The cannon was already charged, to be fired as she dropped into the ocean, when her mother's importunity rescued her. The fact is the more singular, as Jeanne d'Aubigné seems to have been a harsh, unloving mother. Her daughter said she had never been kissed by her but twice in her life. It is probable that maternal coldness was assisted by religious estrangement. Her aunt, Madame de Villette, was like her father Agrippa, a staunch Huguenot, and had brought up Frances in her own faith; but her mother was a Catholic. Once when she took her to mass the little Calvinist turned her back to the altar, for which her ears were boxed; but she bore the punishment with pride, and gloried in suffering for her religion.

The Martinique adventure did not prosper. Constant d'Aubigné remained an incurable spendthrift to the end. Though in want of means, he yet gave his wife a staff of twenty-four slaves to wait upon her. At the end of two years he died, and his widow and children at once returned to France. Again Frances tasted the bitterness of dependence, and the cold welcome of indifferent relations. She fell into the custody of a Madame de Neuillant, an aunt by marriage, who made her a mere drudge in her farmyard, set her to mind her poultry, and shod her with sabots. The religious difficulty again came up, and she was both coaxed and coerced towards a change of faith. Her precocious shrewdness was by this time enlightened as to the position of a Huguenot in France, and her conversion to Catholicism seems to have been a smooth and easy business. In her seventeenth year she met the burlesque writer, Paul Scarron.

Scarron, though barely passed middle age, was a helpless cripple, having only the use of "his right hand, his eyes, and his tongue." But his indomitable vivacity triumphed over his bodily infirmities, and he was regarded as one of the brightest wits and authors of his time. His writings belong to a school as antiquated and forgotten in French literature as the writings of Lilly and Cowley are in ours. They have that perverted ingenuity and laborious pleasantry which seem to us so dreary. There are few less amusing books than his once famous "Roman Comique." Yet Scarron found an ardent admirer in the great Racine, and in any case his house was the resort of the most approved wit and fashion of Paris. Frances d'Aubigné's forlorn condition touched the kind heart of the afflicted joker, and he offered her either to pay her entrance fee in a good convent, or marriage. She chose the latter alternative. She was less than half his age, and though called his wife, was never anything but his nurse. In spite of his maladies, Scarron kept open house, and the company, though distinguished by rank and intelligence, was free,



not to say licentious in conversation. The demure matron of seventeen was at once put upon her mettle, and she soon showed the stuff of which she was made. In three months she had banished all indecorum from her husband's table, and so impressed his companions with her worth and dignity, that one of them said if he were offered the choice of behaving in an unbecoming manner to the Queen (Anne of Austria) or to her, he would prefer doing so to the Queen. With that she was a tender helpmeet, not only ruling his household, but assisting him in his literary work. For eight years the strange union lasted with mutual satisfaction. At his death, Scarron said he had but one regret, that he was unable to leave his wife better off than he did. He indeed left her little but debts. Only a few weeks before his death an incident occurred of singular irony. On August 26th, 1660, Louis XIV. entered Paris with all the pomp which the Court and the capital could command, on the occasion of his marriage with his young queen, Maria Theresa of Spain. Paris had never seen such a show. The nobles and the municipal authorities vied with each other in lavish magnificence, and the procession lasted through the long hours of a summer's day. Madame Scarron witnessed it as an obscure spectator, and wrote an account of it to a friend. "Nothing," she says to her correspondent, "nothing I or any one could say could give you an idea of the magnificent spectacle; nothing could surpass it." Twenty-four years afterwards Madame Scarron herself, after a marriage service carefully concealed, celebrated by night in the palace of Versailles, became the young queen's successor.<sup>1</sup>

On Scarron's death, she had again to face the world without resources. But now she had made influential friends, and she presently procured a pension from the Queen Mother. It was small, but Madame Scarron was a mistress of thrift and economical resource. Her inexpensive and simple attire was not without a certain grave *coquetterie*, and she was careful to be *bien chaussée*. Her remarkable beauty—she was generally called *la belle Indienne*—the charm of her manner and conversation, caused her company to be eagerly sought after. But she had another gift more adapted than these to make her friendship valued, and that was a power of rendering herself infinitely serviceable to all whom she approached. Trained in the hard school of adversity, her natural endowment as a *ménagère* had been developed to a supreme degree. No household that had once received Madame Scarron, but missed and regretted her when she left it. In the drawing-room, the kitchen, or the sick-room she was equally pleasing and unobtrusively useful: but in the nursery, her innate love of children, and skill in their management, made her presence almost indispensable. In rendering these offices,

(1) "Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 72.

she never spared trouble or pains. On one occasion she nursed an old lady for three months without leaving the house. On another, she not only took charge of Madame de Montchevreuil's house and children, but attended to the sale of the farm stock as well. When one of her friends got married, the whole preparation of the wedding devolved upon her. It is easy to understand that such a woman was welcome and popular, and what a valuable education she thus acquired for her subsequent career.

Madame Scarron's virtue is not so exhausted a topic in France as the similar one concerning Queen Elizabeth, is in England. It is still discussed with some vivacity by her blind admirers and blind detractors, who seem to have inherited the passions of her friends and foes in the palace of Versailles. Saint Simon's calumnies against her are still accepted or laid aside with only partial sincerity, by the one; on the other hand, the reverence felt for her by her novices at St. Cyr, does not seem excessive or unwarranted to the others. The unprejudiced inquirer will agree with Ste. Beuve that the evidence against her correctness of conduct is not worth attending to. The fact that she was acquainted, not intimate, with Ninon de l'Enclos, a friend of her husband, has been made the ground of the most injurious inferences and statements. The animosity of her enemies has blinded them to consistency of character. Every trustworthy record proves that Madame de Maintenon moved in a plane which diverged at right angles from the path which leads to sins of the flesh. It was not that she resisted such temptations; she was not aware of them. It was her favourite maxim that an irreproachable behaviour is also the cleverest, in a worldly sense. She acknowledged that a wish to stand well with the world, and win its esteem, was her master passion, and that "she *hated* everything that could expose her to contempt." Her clear and subtle intellect grew out of a soil covered with snow. She owned that it was not out of love that she sedulously nursed her sick friend for three months, but in order to acquire a good reputation. It would be ungenerous to construe this avowal against her too literally. If not warm, she was singularly constant in her affections, and longsuffering even to timidity. Setting aside her religious principles, of which none but the uncandid will dispute the persistency, even if they deny their fervour, it is evident that in her cool, sedate mind, the impulses in question found no place. Far greater and richer would she have been if they had. Her lips were never touched with fire, and no flame, holy or unholy, ever burned in the depths of her heart.

For about ten years Madame Scarron, after her husband's death, led an agreeable life in the most refined circles of Parisian society. She was on terms of intimacy with Madame de Sevigné, who was struck with the mingled amiability and accuracy of her mind. They

supped every night together, and Madame de Sevigné pronounced her company "delicious." It was in these circumstances that a proposition was made to her (the exact date is not known—probably in 1670) which gave a new direction to her fortunes, and one very different from anything she could have expected. She was asked to take charge of certain children of her friend Madame de Montespan; and their father was rumoured to be no other than the king of France.

We now enter upon a period of her life beset with doubt, obscurity, and legend; through which it is difficult to see one's way to trustworthy fact. We have the saintly legend on the one hand (which she herself in her latter years carefully propagated), representing her as the pure soul who, from the loftiest motives, entered the corrupt atmosphere of the court, and that by the most suspicious of back doors. On the other side is the legend which exhibits her in a character but little removed from that of a procuress, with an ambition as mean as it was unscrupulous. The situation, and the person who filled it, afford material of singular dramatic interest, in which the play of a subtle and complex character, winds and circulates amid circumstances more complex still. Our interest in Madame de Maintenon is quenched as soon as we regard her exclusively in the light of either legend, either as a woman of guileless sincerity, or as an accomplished intriguer, devoid of all conscience. She derives her peculiar attraction and piquancy precisely from the constant interaction of contending motives of worldly wisdom and spiritual aspiration, between her struggles to secure a high place at court, and a safe, final retreat to the kingdom of heaven. She pursued both ends with an energy which never relented, and showed a tenacity which cannot be surpassed in her resolution to make the best of both worlds.

She met the tempting offer to take charge of the King's natural children, with refined diplomacy. With Madame de Montespan's children she said she could have no concern, but if the children in question were indeed the King's, and his Majesty were pleased to lay his commands upon her, she was ready to obey. A widow in narrow circumstances might have been excused if she had shown less self-control and insight in the presence of an offer which promised emolument and a secure future. But Madame Scarron saw to the bottom of the situation at once, and how different would be her position if she were employed by the King, or only by his mistress. The King did lay his commands upon her, and at once, with prompt energy, she took the whole burden of her new office. This burden was no light one. The most complete secrecy was one of the stipulations, and she conformed to it with an exactness which would have done credit to a commissary of police. She was lodged with her young charges in a roomy house in the then remote quarter

of the Rue de Vaugirard, but concealed, with an innate genius for dissimulation which could dispense with teaching, her new occupation even from her most intimate friends. With unconscious *naïveté* she boasted in after life of her successful duplicity, and confided to the virgin innocents of St. Cyr the story of her adroit management in hiding the results of sin. "Often," she said, "I passed the whole night watching by the bedside of one of those children when unwell. I returned home by a back door in the morning, and, after dressing, I went out in a carriage from the front door to the Hotel d'Albret, or Richelieu, in order that my usual circle might not suspect that I had any secret to keep." She frequently went on foot to escape notice, and carefully disguised, carrying under her arm clothes, and even food, doing any household work that presented itself, in preference to admitting indiscreet strangers.<sup>1</sup>

Not only Christian saintliness but a strong sense of human dignity might have shrunk from such offices. We must remember that after all such behaviour was fairly in accordance with the views of the courtly world at the time. Vice was not vice when practised by a king. Madame Colbert had taken charge in a similar way of Mademoiselle de la Vallière's children, and nobody was shocked. Neither is Madame de Maintenon shocked. But her new position brought out prominently, perhaps fully revealed, to herself for the first time the two master motives which guided her through life, worldly advancement, and salvation in the next world. No one knew better than she that the licentious court of Louis XIV. was about the last place in which a sensitive piety could feel safe or happy. On the other hand, no courtier at St. Germain or Versailles was more determined to push his fortunes by pleasing the king. Hence an inward conflict which required to be quelled. Hence the need of a sophistry to deceive self and others as regarded the impulse which retained her in a position so inconsistent with her principles of religious severity. She knew well that she was envied rather than blamed for the post she had secured, but she insists on being pitied for it, strives to make herself and others believe that she does violence to her feelings by remaining in it, and that her one anxiety is to get away. She was much helped in this rather difficult task by a judicious choice of a confessor, an intelligent toady, the Abbé Gobelin, who was careful to advise her to do precisely what he saw she wished. We may well believe that he at an early period assured her it was her duty to remain at court however painful it might be. Churchmen in Louis XIV.'s time knew the value of court favour, and a person so near the king as the governess of his children was too valuable a friend to be allowed to indulge in weak scruples about the spiritual healthiness of the place. In the first instance the rather slow-witted

(1) "Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 146

Louis had felt a dread of Madame Scarron, her reputation as a *bel esprit* was a little alarming to his dignity. It was only through Madame de Montespan's influence that his repugnance was overcome. But when he knew her better and saw her closer a great change took place in his impressions. He discovered that the demure and humble head nurse of his children possessed an intellect which by its culture, delicacy and penetration eclipsed the boisterous vigour of his mistress. He found his way with increased frequency to her apartment, and seemed to take more pleasure in his visits the oftener they were made. What did these things mean? Though verging on forty Madame Scarron still retained much of her early beauty, the severity of her morals had long been celebrated, her reprobation of unchastity was notorious. The court, as a microcosm of France, contained a devout party, as well as parties who were by no means devout. These good men, of whom the Duc de Montausier and Bossuet were the recognised chiefs, while reverencing their king to the verge of idolatry, were yet pained beyond expression by his licentious life: his frailty in the presence of female beauty tarnished in their eyes all the surpassing glories of his reign. If he could only be converted to virtuous habits nothing would remain to be desired; but his inclination to appropriate to himself the wives of other men was a menacing evil which threatened to bring the country to ruin. His wars and reckless expenditure, and the widespread misery they caused, were visitations in which piety saw an Almighty hand. These were calamities from which one should pray to be delivered. But the king's incontinency was a misfortune far more urgent and dangerous than any of these. And yet it was a difficult subject to approach. Mascaron, by a sermon of indiscreet zeal on the observance of the seventh commandment, had drawn upon himself rebuke and disgrace. Perhaps the same sentiments from the mouth of a pretty woman might be better received. With whom the thought originated does not appear. But it is certain that the devout party were not long in coming to the conclusion that Madame Scarron might be successfully used as a sort of female missionary to bring about the conversion of the king. Herewith a prospect opened before her beyond the dreams of hope or ambition. All contradictions were reconciled. Piety and patriotism, charity for her neighbour, just pride in her king, all converged to command her to stay at court, to save his soul and make her own fortune.

But although the theory was clear, its application was beset with difficulties. The elements of the problem were complex and not easily co-ordinated. Firstly, there was the large debt of gratitude to Madame de Montespan for her introduction to court. Secondly, there was the king's passion for his mistress still at a high temperature. Thirdly, there were the children to be reared in dutiful

reverence to the king, but in a strange ambiguous attitude towards their mother. Fourthly, there were the interests of religion which commanded the expulsion of the benefactress, and a thorough reformation of the king's habits. The skill with which Madame Scarron rode these four horses abreast proves her to have been endowed with very extraordinary qualities. She commenced by putting herself in a safe position against any reproaches of the mistress, by exhorting her to a godly life. Loyal friendship, christian charity, could not do less than warn an erring sister of the danger of her ways. But after this frankness she was free to speak to the king, when opportunity offered, and the ample mantle of religious zeal was more than sufficient to shelter her from all insinuations of ingratitude or self-seeking. As regards the children, the obstacles were trifling, Madame Scarron's pure and perfect love of children is one of the most attractive traits in her character. It cost her nothing to win their love from their harsh and imperious mother. Remained the fourth impediment, the king's attachment to his mistress.

No sacred bard, or, what would have been much better, no prying, eavesdropping Boswell has painted for us the "terrible scenes" which soon ensued. When it at last became clear to Montespan that her creature, her underling, her drudge, was threatening to become her rival, the explosion of choler, as we may well conceive, was very grand indeed. Pent up together in a narrow space at Versailles or St. Germain, the two ladies were brought into daily, almost hourly, contact. It was a situation to bring out the fighting qualities of tame women, and neither of these was tame, though they differed much in their style of courage. It says a good deal for their self-command that they never came to blows. Once apparently they nearly did, when they suffered themselves to be surprised by the King in a crisis so violent that he found them quite hot with the ardour of battle. With a simplicity which must have been feigned, he asked what was the matter. Madame Scarron recovered her calm on the instant, and made answer, "If your Majesty will pass into the adjoining apartment, I shall have the honour of telling you."<sup>1</sup> Montespan let them go, choked, we may presume, with floods of rage, bewilderment, and despair. Her soft, feline enemy then unbosomed herself to the King, told of the harshness, the injustice, the cruelty of Madame de Montespan, and struck an attitude, we may depend, in which piety, beauty, and Christian resignation struggled to produce a complete effect. "Have you not remarked," said the King, rather ungallantly, "how her fine eyes

(1) "Il se passe ici des choses terribles entre Madame de Montespan et moi : le roi en fut hier témoin."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 264.—Mem. de Madame de Caylus.

fill with tears whenever she hears of a touching and generous action?" It was a churlish question, and must have been a heavy blow, showing that fine eyes might still be a match for religious lovemaking, and a menacing hint not to proceed too fast, or attempt to carry matters with a high hand. But Madame de Maintenon's endurance and tenacity of patience were more than equal to the emergency. "I spoke yesterday," she writes to the toady confessor, "to Madame de Montespan, and begged her and the King not to consider any ill-humour I showed as a proof of sulkiness towards them. She and I are again to have a conference this morning. I intend to be very soft in all I say; still I remain firm in the intention to leave them at the end of the year, and I shall employ my time till then in praying God to lead me where it will be best for my salvation."<sup>1</sup> It would no doubt be difficult to draw, with perfect equity, the line here which separated subtle self-deception from half-conscious hypocrisy. That both were present we may charitably believe—cant and sincerity; or, as Mr. Carlyle says, "sincere cant." However, men and women must fight the battle of life with such weapons as they can command, and neither cant nor sincerity could be dispensed with in this crisis. With a devout party anxiously looking on and watching this singular duel between two strange champions, with an immoral party equally anxious and supporting the cause of "fine eyes," one could not afford to give points. All the more reason for making one's own side feel the value of the services rendered. "I know," she writes to the useful confessor, "that I can save myself here, but I think I could do it better elsewhere. I cannot believe it is God's wish that I should suffer from Madame de Montespan. I have a thousand times desired to take the vows, and the fear of repenting such a step has made me pass over impulses which many would have considered proofs of vocation." The confessor, for once, proved himself a dunce as well as a toady, and began to take her at her word, and hinted belief in her wish to adopt a religious life. She lost no time in undeceiving him. "I have expressed myself badly," she writes, "if you understood that I was thinking of becoming a nun. I am too old to change my position now, and according to the fortune I receive from the King" (she was justly expecting a fitting reward for the trouble she had taken with his children), "I shall set about establishing myself in perfect quietude."<sup>2</sup> Before her brother, less diplomacy was required, and to him she says, "It

(1) "Je priais le roi et elle de ne point regarder la mauvaise humeur où je leur paraissais comme une bouderie contre eux. . . . Madame de Montespan et moi devons nous parler ce matin : ce sera de ma part avec beaucoup de douceur."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 212.

(2) "Je me suis mal expliquée, si vous avez compris que je pense à être religieuse; je suis trop vieille pour changer de condition."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 210.

was thought I had been got rid of here" (at Versailles), "but you who know me will also know that I am not so easily got rid of."<sup>1</sup> These extracts, taken from her letters written at the moment, which might be indefinitely multiplied, give a very different impression from that of the simpering legend which, long years after, she propagated for the edification of her novices of St. Cyr, in which she appears as the meek and miraculous instrument of a higher power, and touching victim sacrificed to the needs of state.

At last Montespan's broad moon of favour waned, narrowed, and disappeared, and Maintenon waxed brighter than ever in antithetical splendour. Her unflinching admirers await us here with arguments, they deem demonstrative of her pious and perfect disinterestedness. Between Montespan's eclipse and the queen's death, they ask us how to explain her conduct except on the hypothesis of her unselfish regard for the king's morals, her devout yearning to make him a model of continency and Christian virtue. The queen, we are told, declared that under God she owed it to Madame de Maintenon, that after twenty years of neglect her husband began to treat her with kindness. It is supposed that this evidence of Madame de Maintenon's purity of motive cannot be resisted. She could not have foreseen, it is remarked, the queen's proximate death. She could not, if she had, have aimed at taking her place, and as for taking the place of Montespan, it cannot even be mentioned with propriety. Therefore pure religion, and undefiled by worldly interest, alone impelled her. Is this conclusion quite clear? Let us grant that she reconciled husband and wife. Let her have all the credit which such an achievement deserves. From her point of view it was a triumph fitted to win the applause of angels, and we need not doubt that her good work was its own reward. Let us also loudly proclaim that her own virtue was impeccable, and that she would have given her body to be burned, rather than yield a hair's breadth to unchastity. But was there no other path open along which ambition could move? Was there not a place vacant for a female confessor, or rather was not that place already admirably filled in the unanimous opinion of the godly by Madame de Maintenon herself? And was it not a place of surpassing honour, and exquisite in its singularity? Let us imagine a woman in whom the vulgar passions are extinct, or rather never existed: let us suppose her with a strong propensity to a formal and legal righteousness, who coupled therewith a deep but wary ambition. Thus stated, the problem is as good as solved. But farther, was the queen a hindrance, or not rather a valuable instrument in her hand? The queen was not a rival to be feared for a moment—the poor meek woman who stood in

(1) " . . . l'on crut être défait de nous. Vous croirez bien, vous qui nous connaissez, que l'on ne s'en défait pas si aisément."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 336.



such awe of the king, that she trembled in every limb when he sent for her unexpectedly. What would have been dangerous was another young mistress of Madame de Montespan type, brilliant and enterprising, who might soon make havoc of the king's good resolutions, and fill the faces of the devout with shame and confusion. But while the queen lived, and the king remained on good terms with her—and the female confessor who had done so much might be trusted to ensure that—a pledge for his good behaviour was, so to speak, held in hand. So far from being an obstacle, the queen was a most useful pawn in Madame de Maintenon's game, and we may well believe that her death filled the latter with no slight perturbation. It changed indeed the position into a critical phase. Madame de Maintenon's place, beside a widower, was very different from what it had been beside a married man, protected by his wife. Would the newly-acquired virtue of the king remain firm? Policy dissuaded another marriage with some foreign princess. Another young royal family was not to be desired in the state of the finances, but no one could guarantee that one would not arrive, if the king married again. But what was the alternative? Madame de Maintenon, we are told, at this time passed through a period of mental anxiety, very unusual to her austere and self-controlled temper. She not only shed abundant tears, but became so restless that she roamed in the forest of Fontainebleau, with a single companion, sometimes even at unseemly hours. The few letters she wrote at this epoch reveal profound agitation of spirit. Presently the clouds break, and she is seen sitting in lofty calm, radiant with a happiness which she does not explain. It is probable that during this trying interval the proposition of her marriage with the king was discussed and decided in the affirmative. We may well believe that so momentous a decision was not arrived at without aching doubt and hesitation. The exact date of the marriage has never been divulged. All that is known is that probably in June 1684 seven persons were assembled at midnight in one of the private apartments of the palace of Versailles. These were the king and his bride, Father la Chaise, who said mass, the archbishop of Paris who gave the nuptial blessing, Louvois and Montchevreuil who were witnesses, and Bontemps, the first *valet de chambre*, who prepared the altar and served the mass. The widow of Paul Scarron had become the actual but unrecognised queen of France. She was forty-nine, and the king forty-six years of age.

J. COTTER MORISON.

(To be concluded in the next number.)

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE two great free governments of the world are for the moment passing under a cloud. America is disgraced by the exposure of administrative corruption, and England by more than one exhibition of parliamentary levity and hypocrisy.

The proceedings of the last month with respect to the Royal Titles Bill have been tainted with hypocrisy from beginning to end. Everybody is perfectly well aware that this Bill was introduced to gratify a personal wish of the Sovereign. That wish may have arisen from a kindly solicitude to mark the Queen's sense of the friendly reception of her son by some of the great native princes in India, or it may have been prompted by difficulties alleged to exist in domestic ceremony and family etiquette. We do not exercise ourselves in these high matters. We would only say in passing that the Queen can hardly be blamed for supposing that a personal wish for what seemed no more than a trifling personal decoration would be respected and gratified. How is the Queen to know that the boundless loyalty about which the newspapers are never wearied of raving is not to be taken seriously? If she opens parliament, or visits a hospital, or does any other work of duty or supererogation, she reads the next day in half the journals in the country that she has been received with the fervent acclamations of vast crowds, that English subjects never loved a sovereign so devotedly in all our history, that we cherish the monarchy as the saving keystone of the social arch, and so forth, through the whole gamut of fulsome homiages. If a member of her family goes to a provincial town to open a public hall, or at a public lunch, the same unmanly chorus rises and swells and sinks away. How can the Sovereign know that all this is mere words, the mechanical adulation of the *claque*? It ought not to be impossible for mayors to receive royal personages, and for able editors to report and comment upon their doings, with perfect respect and even gratification, yet in a manly, sensible, self-respecting way.

The feeling of the country is perfectly plain. There are the people of the Court Circular, who may be credited with an honest Oriental delight in self-prostration. There are the great aristocracy, who look on the crown much as the Venetian senate looked on the Doge. It is an appendage of their own system, and a token of security for their position, but still always to be kept strictly in its place. Then there is a base little multitude among the new rich, who would probably barter away every political right they have if that would procure them some trifle of recognition, some wretched bauble, from the fountain of honour. The bulk of the middle class have a friendly, but not in the least degree enthusiastic feeling, about the throne; they are glad that it is respectable and clear of scandal,—and this, it seems, is too rare a trait in monarchy not to be cherished and greatly expatiated upon. The women of the middle class, being excluded from public interests of a real kind, and with no better field for their imaginations than a rather dreary and narrow faith, have a sort of superficial attachment to the person of the

sovereign. Most of the clergy, for the same reasons, profess the same sentiment. The common people, that is to say the bulk of the nation, are fond of pageant, and if they do not see a prince too frequently, will cheer him as readily as any one else associated with a pageant, but not more readily. There is no envy in an English crowd, nor is there fetish-worship; only a natural curiosity. Those whose lives are very hard are ever curious to see the representatives of luxury and splendour, as if they were beings from another sphere. As to the institution of monarchy, they are not hostile to it; they are indifferent. The lustre and antique renown of our throne, of which so much has been said lately, is to them naught. They have no defined desire for a republic, though it is worth noticing that any reference to the stout republican effort in France is sure to be received with enthusiasm in any great public meeting in England. Friendly respect and good-will seem to us to be the terms that most truly describe the prevailing feeling about the Queen.

This is a very different thing from true imaginative loyalty, and a very different thing from that abject sentiment which makes the newspapers unreadable by self-respecting Englishmen when such an event takes place for instance as the Thanksgiving of February, 1872. The Queen, however, must naturally be the last person in the country to find out that the language of "municipal sycophants," to borrow Mr. Anderson's wholesome description, and of rotund leading articles, is mere moonshine. If all that the *claqueurs* said was sincere, the Queen might well suppose that there could be little reason why she should not add an ornament to the crown; and yet the high personage who is the object of all these professions no sooner seeks to put a little more gilding on the state coach, than she finds that she was only treated to a Grand Lama's adoration on condition of imitating a Grand Lama's nullity, and existing without will.

The first announcement that the Queen was about to take a new title was received with moderate satisfaction. The general feeling was that of Mazarin, when young Lewis XIV. objected to call Oliver Cromwell by the usual style of sovereign rulers. "Shall I call such a fellow my *brother*?" "Aye," said Mazarin, "call him your *father*, if need be, if you would get from him what you desire." If the Sovereign sought an Indian title, why not? The public on the whole was rather gratified at the titular recognition of our vast responsibilities in India. This assent was due to carelessness. People had not realised that sycophants would be likely to transform the customary titles into the phrases of imperialism. The Minister's arts began at the beginning. He talked of prerogative and wished to conceal the proposed title. To take a leap in the dark of this kind was too much to be borne even by the present House. Then he proceeded to invent reasons why it was desirable that the imperial title should be assumed. The princes of India wished it and the people of India would rejoice in it. When asked to give evidence of this, he refused. Everybody knows that there is no such evidence, and there can be no such evidence. Everybody knows that the alleged reason is fictitious. Various other shifts came next, such as the assertion that the crown would receive new splendour; followed by the assertion shortly after that the Queen is never on any account, either herself or her family, to be allowed by her ministers to use the title of

Empress or any of its appurtenances in England. Then came reasons which Mr. Lowe energetically qualified as "miserable frivolity and drivelling," and which it would be humiliating to reproduce. And finally, Mr. Disraeli intrepidly declared that the real reason was a desire to warn Russia that her advances in Central Asia towards our Indian frontier had at length put us on our mettle, and that we should give that power the effective warning that was needed, and stimulate the loyalty and confidence of our Indian fellow-subjects, by conferring a title on the Sovereign which will be translated by the same word as that which translates her present title. We could wish that Mr. Lowe or Mr. Cowen had found in their hearts to describe this audacious statement by its plain name. If, as for some reasons seems probable, the Government is going to lend an ear to the ideas of the Bombay school as to the North West Frontier—and on these we pronounce no opinion—they are certainly not the men to suppose that that stern problem will be solved by any legerdemain of styles and titles and ceremonial proclamations. If the Russian advance unsettles India, and stirs a ferment in bazaars and villages—and there are too many good grounds for fearing that this must be the case—no man on earth can believe that the disturbance of feeling will be appeased by the mummeries of the herald and the court usher. Of course Mr. Disraeli does not believe it. The history of the Royal Titles Bill has been a series of mockeries from beginning to end. What men of honour and integrity do Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell seem! No worse degradation of the character of parliament has ever taken place. The title itself is a matter of secondary importance, compared with the hypocrisies that have accompanied its assumption. Certainly those persons—and they are not wanting—who would be glad to see England free of the social demoralisations which are inevitably bound up with a hereditary monarchy that has survived into an industrial society, can find nothing to regret in what has happened. Apart from whatever effect it may have had in diminishing the personal popularity of the Sovereign—a point on which we do not care to dwell—it has left an ill-sounding word among the old titles, like the fly in the apothecary's pot of ointment; and it has set an example of unsettlement and resettlement of title, which may perhaps set men thinking in the days of one of our future Emperors. If posterity has improved as perfectibilarians hope, Mr. Disraeli's memory will scarcely be of the kind to make a diadem of his conferring sacred.

Meanwhile, the public sentiment on the new title is not in the least vehement. The original careless approval has been succeeded by a mild irritation. But outside of Pall Mall and some of the London newspaper offices, there is nothing like that indignation which it is convenient to manufacture at Westminster for party purposes. The title is in any case a trifle, compared with the demoralisation of public character; and even the extremest Liberal may deplore the sight of a great body of men, who in private life are the souls of uprightness and truth, greeting with 'loud and protracted cheers' arguments which they must know to be neither more nor less than mendacious.

The same feeling is moved by the futile policy of the government as to the Churchyards (Mar. 8). Here again the matter has marks of dissimula-

tion. Liberals want the question of the churchyards settled for two reasons. In the first place, the proper settlement of that question will be a sign of the moderation, reasonableness, and good sense of the ecclesiastical party, and the more of these qualities is spread over the country, the better is the prospect for those who have good and reasonable causes in hand. The partisans of disestablishment, for instance, can desire nothing so much as that the ecclesiastical party should show an honest and candid spirit in the smaller things, as that will be the best pledge for right conduct when the time comes for the greater things. Another ground for wishing the Burials Bill out of the way is that it impedes progress towards a much more important Bill. It allows too many members of parliament and too many aspirants for parliament to keep a great reputation for love of religious equality at a very cheap price. It is time that such persons should be pressed to consider the full extension of the principle of religious equality, and not allowed to escape on some partial application of it. Meanwhile, no doubt, that principle must be brought forward in its reference to minor questions, such as the Churchyards or the Schools. The discussion that takes place on the minor questions serves to educate opinion, and opens a way in men's minds to the full doctrine. The attitude of the ecclesiastical party in this poor matter is a more effective answer than any Liberal could have devised to the amiable school of the Comprehensionists. And it is unfortunately difficult to respect our opponents as we could wish, when one thinks of them submitting to be led to their little victory by a leader who says it is a sanitary and not an ecclesiastical question. This, however, is only another illustration of the hypocrisy of the present parliamentary parties.

The Home Rule section enables us to furnish one more example of the same vice. The proceedings in connection with the Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill are a practical demonstration of the utter hollowness of the current assertions of the readiness of English parties to concede equal rights and privileges to the sister kingdom. The Home Rulers are bent on proving that the existence of the Union in its present form perpetuates distinctions between the two countries, to the injury of popular self-government in the smaller island. The Municipal Franchise Bill was promoted by the whole strength of the party which, we must always remember, undoubtedly represents the wishes and aspirations of the great majority of the people of Ireland. Its object is to assimilate the municipal government of the two countries. It affects only the internal arrangements of Irish local affairs: it does not even indirectly threaten the continued subsistence of Imperial relations. On the contrary, nothing would be more likely to weaken the demand for separation, and to fuse the interests of the two nations, than a frank concession of the demand for identity of institutions. Yet the claim is resisted by those who denounce Home Rule as an artificial and factious remedy for an imaginary grievance; and the Irish people are told that English statesmanship will deny what Irish folly ignorantly asks for. It would be wiser to assume, if we are really anxious to cement the union, that the Irish people are the most fitting judges of what is best for them, especially when they do us the honour to base their request on our experience and example.

The *Times* newspaper seized the occasion for one of those silly attacks upon our municipal institutions by which it strives to force on public attention its favourite device of the Cumulative vote. The *Times* is still a great political power in this country, but it will seriously strain its influence, if, in order to push a particular manipulation of voting power it thinks it necessary to parade a cynical contempt for the local government which has played so large a part in the education of the English people, and has enlisted the active cooperation and sympathy of disinterested citizens of all classes in every city and borough in the country. The writer of the article on the debate on the Irish Municipal franchise, speaking probably from some small acquaintance with the parochial government of the metropolis, which is under the administration of innumerable vestries, and is denied the privileges conceded to many a small provincial town, says of our municipal government generally that "it is commonly ignorant, frequently selfish, occasionally corrupt." No statement could be more misleading or more unfair. The members of our reformed corporations are as well informed about the subjects of their administration, more unselfish and less corrupt, than the House of Commons itself. When the *Times* goes on to say that the "great defect of our municipal institutions is that those who contribute the smallest proportion of local taxation should be able to extinguish the representation of the rest," it merely repeats, with the substitution of one word, the argument of those who opposed the Reform Bill of 1832, and every subsequent effort to enlarge the basis of the suffrage. And this alleged and unproved defect would certainly not be remedied by the Cumulative vote, unless in those exceptional instances where a miscalculation in the probable result of this arithmetical device has given for a time the representation into the hands of a minority of the electors.'

Nor does our present experience give the least ground for saying that the Cumulative vote would improve the character of the representation. School Boards are not on the average more enlightened or more honourable than Town Councils. In some cases the novelty of their work, and the fact that ministers of religion and women are eligible, have attracted some new, but not necessarily better qualified elements, and introduced them to public life. It is observable, however, that many have already fallen out of the ranks, and their places are being refilled from the ordinary constituents of the local authorities. On the other hand, the introduction into Town Councils of any system of minority representation would largely increase the obstructive power of certain anti-social sections of the community—as the publicans and the owners of small house property. The true remedy, as we said last month, for any real or apparent defects in our municipal government is not the cumulative vote, but cumulative functions, though for that matter neither of them necessarily excludes the other.

A very serious increase has been announced in the expense of the army, but parliament has not given to the subject any of the attention that was promised at the beginning of the session. Such discussion as took place was entirely hollow. Both parties have a distinct presentiment that neither the extra twopence per day, nor any other augmentation of pay such as parliament would consent to, is at all likely to give us the number and quality

of men that are wanted. But neither party is prepared to face the risk of any steps tending to the substitution of a national for a standing army. The Conservative classes are from all their sentiments and traditions hostile to a reduction of the professional armed force, and they are hostile to that transfer of all power to popular hands which would be the result of substituting a national training. Of the Liberals, many are still in the bonds of the old delusion that Great Britain will never again be at war, and that if she is at war, invasion is impossible. Others are too acute not to see the insecurity of both of these propositions, but they lack the courage to admit to their minds the only practicable conclusion. No doubt a certain amount of courage is needed to urge upon a constituency such a proposal for a national training to arms as was set out by Sir Henry Havelock in the last number of this Review. The demonstration against the most wholesome drill enforced in the London Board Schools was a significant symptom of the popular dislike of compulsory military training, even in its most rudimentary and harmless form. The feeling of the Volunteer movement, however, ought not to be forgotten on the other side. Meantime, it cannot be too constantly repeated that the people of Great Britain are living on like a merchant who refuses to insure. The military experts know this, and so do many men of high political authority. They can only hope that the deluge will not come till they are gone.

We have spoken of American corruption, and the financial scandals of which their newspapers bring us fresh details every day. At any rate, the partisans of despotism cannot be allowed to find any argument in this. In absolute governments, like Russia, for instance, administrative corruption is still more common. Only the control of public opinion is less vigilant, and the press less free; consequently, abuses go unperceived, at least by foreigners like ourselves. But for all that, it must be confessed that when corruption invades the highest spheres of administration, whether in America or elsewhere, we are bound to seek the cause of so grave and distressing a malady.

Montesquieu, repeating the ideas of old writers, says that virtue is the base of a republic, as honour is the base of a monarchy. At first this seems a hard saying. Virtue, one thinks, is necessary under all forms of government, but why more necessary to a republic than to a monarchy? We perceive the difference if we look at what is happening in the United States. In a monarchy, high functions belong ordinarily to men who are wealthy, who have great consideration, and who are protected against temptation by their desire not to lose caste, in other words by honour. In a republic, popular election brings to the front persons of humble origin, of no resources, and eager to get on in the world. So long as simplicity of manner and severity of principles prevail in the country, men of this kind remain honest, as until lately was the case in the United States. But when the taste for luxury and costly pleasure begins to spread, they no longer resist the opportunity of growing rich at the expense of the state. People have mocked the old idea that only an austere life and Spartan habits are suited to the republican system, and the United States used to be expressly cited to illustrate the complete compatibility of democratic institutions with the accumulation of wealth and boundless opulence. Circumstances are showing

that the ancient philosophers were right and the modern economists wrong. We shall see it more and more clearly established that a democratic system cannot last without great equality of material conditions. If wealth accumulates in the hands of the upper classes, then two causes of destruction will threaten the republic. On one side the lower classes with votes at their disposal, will be inclined to strike those above them, by throwing all the social burdens upon them. On the other side, the small men finding themselves in office, and their covetousness aroused by the examples of prodigality in the opulent classes, will insist on living in the same style. Then if at the same time religion and morality have lost their influence, what will be left to arrest the decline? The community will be pillaged and justice put up to auction.. This is the very picture that New York has presented for some years, and the outlines of the same spectacle are becoming fatally visible in the Federal Government. Everywhere equality is excellent. In a democratic republic it is indispensable.

The recent events in France deserve the closest attention. A political problem is at issue of the very highest importance both for England and for all the continental nations. Will they succeed in definitely founding the republic in a great country that has for centuries been accustomed to monarchy? "But," the French republicans will answer, "the question is settled once for all. Behold the Chamber of Deputies. We are 330; 92 Bonapartists, 58 Orleanists, 36 Legitimists; in all, no more than 186 monarchists. We have thus a majority of two-thirds, and we have the same in the Senate. We are therefore the masters; we shall not only uphold republican institutions, we shall have a republican government as well." The moment when everybody says that the Republic is definitely established is the most opportune possible for asking whether it will last.. The monarchists have brought it into existence without intending it; the republicans may slay it without knowing it.

M. Guizot who destroyed the monarchy in dread of a republic, still confessed that the republic which he dreaded was the noblest form of government. If, as the constitutions of free countries proclaim, all powers emanate from the nation, then logically he who exercises executive power ought also to be chosen by the nation. The hereditary and irresponsible qualities of the crown, by placing it above the national will, are evidently an inconsistency in a country of self-government. The more enlightened the citizens become, and the more conscious of their rights, the more firmly will they insist on conducting public affairs either by themselves or by delegates of their own selection; the less readily will they allow these powers to fall into the hands of a monarch acting independently of them. The republican system seems therefore to be the ideal towards which all nations are moving at a more or less rapid rate.

We must, however, confess that history does not by any means corroborate these anticipations. We have seen a number of republics transform themselves into monarchies; there is no example of a great monarchy succeeding in transforming itself and continuing to exist as a republic. In the middle ages from the north to the south Europe was full of republics. Only Switzerland remains. Two great nations, France and England, have



attempted with heroic efforts to found the republic. Both have failed, and France has failed twice. The great Polish republic was partitioned, and when Rulhière wrote his history, he thought he could find no better name for it than *The Anarchy of Poland*. Each of the great shocks that Europe has undergone has been fatal to a Republic, so delicate seems their constitution, and so little adapted to brave the storms of the modern epoch. The wars undertaken at the end of the last century to found new republics ended by killing nearly all the old ones, and the war of 1866 closed the career of the only two that still survived in Germany, Frankfurt and Hamburg.

No doubt, on the other side of the Atlantic new republics have arisen, but those of Latin origin drag on an existence which is consumed by anarchy, without even the ability to settle a government strong enough to secure order. The great English Republic alone has prospered, and its development has been so wonderful that it has filled the friends of democracy with hope. It must not, however, be forgotten that the United States have enjoyed quite exceptional advantages, which we need not now enumerate. What then is the conclusion from the facts? One thing only, not that France ought to despair of founding the republic, but that the French republicans ought to be persuaded that the success of their enterprise presents enormous difficulties and demands infinite perspicacity and prudence. France is bound to remain a republic under pain of dishonour and ruin, for if the existing régime were to fall to pieces, the Empire is heir. Now what could the Empire be in the hands of a lad devoid of experience, and a woman who is ignorant, bigoted, and passionate? Two dangers may imperil the Republic: on the one side the impatience of the republicans: on the other the alarms of the Conservatives. The French in general, and especially those who style themselves children of the Revolution, are, as we all know, endowed with a spirit of excessive abstraction and misplaced logic. This spirit leads them to insist on the realisation of their ideas, without paying any heed either to the nature of things, or to the reactions they may provoke. As soon as they think they have truth and right on their side, all is to yield. "*Perish the colonies rather than a principle!*" This sums up that heroic but impracticable policy.

The pusillanimity of the Conservatives constitutes another danger. As soon as ever they miss the support of an oppressive and repressive government, they are sure that all is lost. The Red Spectre is an object of genuine dread to them, as ghosts are to little children. They dread the division of property in a country where proprietors form the majority of the nation. It was they who threw the country into the hands of Louis Napoléon in terror of the 'Partageux.' To-day the sects have made no sign. Socialism has not even shown its flag in the last elections. Communism seems dead. Still the Conservatives are afraid. The memories of the Commune,—which in truth are not very cheerful,—haunt them and make them tremble. After the Dufaure ministry, they see Gambetta; after Gambetta, Naquet; after Naquet the incendiaries of the Commune, restored by an amnesty.

These alarms are puerile, the Republicans will say. In the two Chambers the majority is republican, but of a very moderate and reasonable repub-

licanism. France has never been more tranquil, more seriously devoted to industry, less disturbed by factions. We cannot take any account of these baseless fears. But then, unhappily, these fears are a fact, and we ought always to take account of facts, however absurd they may be. Such apprehensions may have two consequences, equally vexatious. The first is this. The Conservatives are the rich, and it is the rich who maintain that trade in luxuries on which great towns live, and Paris above all. It is the confidence of the rich that keeps up prices, and it is high prices that keep industry going. The existing mechanism of exchange and industrial organization is very perfect, but at the same time very complicated, and as a consequence of being that, it is very exposed to derangement. For two years France has been reassured. Economic activity has taken a wonderful start. To inspire any disquiet as to the future is to arrest this, and then people begin to cry out: "This cannot go so. The true republic, the republic governed by republicans, kills credit, trammels industry, impoverishes the country. How much better things went under the Empire," and so forth.

The second danger which may result from these alarms is that they may take serious hold of the mind of the President. This side of the question is difficult to clear up; it is full of unknown elements, but everybody feels vaguely that there is peril. Up to what point does the President admit the practice of the constitutional system, which gives to the Chamber the right of imposing ministers on the executive power? Would he resign himself to a Gambetta ministry? It is not many months since M. Buffet declared to the Chamber that the Marshal would never lend himself to be the instrument of radicalism. The President wrote him a letter of congratulation on these words, though they undoubtedly contained the threat of a coup d'état. Now that the country has given a great majority to those whom M. Buffet called the Radicals, the President may have undergone a change of sentiment, but he may also believe in a social danger only to be conjured away by his own hand. A piquant saying is attributed to him, which he probably never uttered, but which perhaps conveys his impressions:—"J'ai dit naguère: J'y suis, j'y reste. Aujourd'hui, j'y reste, mais je n'y suis plus." Soldiers on the Continent, at any rate, do not love and cannot love the constitutional system. The spirit of an army is different from the spirit of a parliament. In the army the chief commands, and the subaltern obeys. In parliament it is all discussion and criticism. A Chamber that obeys and does not discuss, like the Legislative Body under the first Empire, is a decoy, only serving to mask deception. An army that discusses and does not obey is a public danger. There is, therefore, necessarily, at least latent, antagonism between the army and the parliament. It is certain that the President cannot feel any sympathy either with the Senate or the Chamber, with which he is called to govern. A general accustomed to command is ill prepared to play the delicate, submissive, self-effacing part of a constitutional sovereign, on whom the majority imposes ministers and laws.

It is hardly likely that the President intends to make a coup d'état in his own favour. He has no children; he is not in a position to found a dynasty; he would therefore gain nothing by it. But exasperated by the

exigencies of the Left, alarmed at the agitations which they might provoke, he might possibly think it his duty to take energetic measures to "save the country." Already those have been found about him to give him counsels of this kind, and persons will certainly not be wanting in the future who will tell him in all good faith that this is his bounden duty. The present situation is not unlike that of 1789: the same confidence in the definite establishment of a free régime: the same danger of conflict between the two powers; but with this difference, that Lewis XVI. was a weak, vacillating, and disarmed man who could not count on the troops, whereas Macmahon is a general of great energy who would certainly succeed in raising the troops against the *bavards*.

When we think of continental affairs, we must always take account of the undeniable fact, that the constitutional system is at the mercy of the army, and only subsists by sufferance of the executive power. A Chief Magistrate invested with the chief command of the troops, always comes at last, if he is bent on it, to make himself loved by them, and from that moment he has it in his power to sweep away any parliament that may thwart him. By instinct the officers are attached to the executive power, because that power has the sword, and they have little love for those who discuss and pare down the war estimates. As for the common soldiers, unless a very powerful idea is carrying away the whole country and acting on them along with the rest, they will follow their leader. From this it follows that a parliament ought always to avoid driving the executive power into a corner.

If that be done, a coup d'état would then not be impossible, if the conservative interests were to be alarmed to such a point as to make the maintenance of the republic seem a social danger; and if at the same time the President were to be forced to countersign measures that he considered it a dishonour to approve.

The declaration of war against the Dufaure ministry by M. Gambetta's journal seems to be a mistake. It was the monarchists who made the Republic; it is the parliamentarians, and not the republicans of the eve and the republicans pure, who are best fitted to accustom France to it. The hour has hardly yet come for thinking of a Gambetta ministry. M. Gambetta will have more real power and influence in guiding his friends in the Chamber than in office, where he would find himself unable to satisfy those who had borne him thither. People have watched him conducting the electoral campaign with such skill, moderation, and clearness of judgment, that a mass of prejudice against him has already disappeared. But we have to watch what his line of conduct will be now that he is at the head of a numerous army in the Chamber. The rational policy would consist in abstaining from the overthrow of the existing ministry, and in pressing upon it all the measures proper for the consolidation of republican institutions.

It has been said that the elections to the Chamber had a very marked anti-clerical tendency, and in fact, as the clergy everywhere supported the enemies of the Republic, they have found themselves sharing the rout of their allies. The republicans are almost all of opinion that measures must be taken to arrest the progress of ultramontanism, which has been so systematically favoured under every previous system. But what measures?

To combat the political action of the Catholic Church which according to the decisions of its infallible head, is hostile to all modern liberties, there are, it seems, two means: the first, which might be called the American system, consists in the complete separation of the Church from the State, and in ignoring the very existence of the different denominations. The second, on the contrary, consists in fortifying the action of the State on the different churches; in upholding them, on the one hand, in so far as they spread moral and religious notions among the people, and on the other hand, in reining them in, whenever they attempt to interfere in political affairs. This is the system which is now applied in Prussia, and which was followed by Lewis XIV. in the articles of 1682, and afterwards by Joseph II. in Austria, and by William in the Low Countries.

In France the separation of the Church from the State was inscribed in the programme of nearly all the republicans as well as of many moderate liberals, like Laboulaye and Pressensé. It would begin by at once suppressing the budget of worship. At present Gambetta himself declares that this is a measure to be kept for a later day; and he is probably right, for it would give rise to violent struggles and desperate resistances, which ought by all means to be avoided at the opening of a régime which is still new and exposed to many threatening hazards. It is in the field of national education that they ought to stay the encroachments of ultramontaniam, for in no other field are they more dangerous. Whoever is master of education is master of the future. With the present Senate, it will probably be impossible to repeal the new law on superior instruction, detestable as it is, but they might arrest its main vice by restoring the examinations to the State professors. The mixed juries they have adopted for the purpose of conferring academic degrees are the most mischievous of all systems, as experience has shown in Belgium. Several partisans of the Wallon Law who sit in the Senate, M. Laboulaye among others, resisted this feature, and would probably help to abolish it. It may be said that the exercise of the liberal professions ought to be completely free; but if we believe that examinations are needed as guarantees of professional capacity, it is the State only that can by its representatives decide whether these guarantees are adequate. Private institutions ought to be subjected to control, and not to exercise it. Superior instruction ought to be completely reorganized on the base of the ancient universities, like those of Germany to-day and those of France in old times. It ought to be liberally endowed, so as to be on a level with the scientific institutions of other countries. Primary instruction ought to be withdrawn from the predominant influence of the clergy, and out of the hands of the *Petits Frères*, who are gradually taking the place of the lay teachers. Instruction ought to be declared free and compulsory, as M. Duruy wished to make it in the days of the Empire. The Republic cannot be solidly established nor produce good results, except by the general diffusion of knowledge.

The declaration of principles communicated to the two chambers by the Dufaure Cabinet was conceived in an excellent spirit, and has been taken well by journals of every shade, except the *République Française*. What is satisfactory in this document from the European point of view is that it is so thoroughly pacific. Gambetta himself speaks in the same sense. France

seems bent on concentrating all its activity on the difficult work of internal reconstruction. Such an attitude of public opinion is a great pledge of peace, for this among other reasons, that it takes away from Germany every pretext, and what is more important, every reason for desiring or intending war.

Perhaps M. Gambetta has made a false step in trying to effect a fusion among the various groups of the left, so as to offer a united opposition to the Cabinet. It is, however, to be said that he is strictly following the very course which would be followed by an English parliamentary leader. The French Conservatives are really acting in distinct violation of the English practice. Imagine a majority of two hundred for Disestablishment, and the Sovereign proceeding to appoint a ministry of which the most severely anti-ecclesiastical member should be, say, Mr. Forster, with Lord Cairnes and the Marquis of Salisbury for colleagues. However, as a matter of fact, and probably judiciously, the majority of the republican party has given the ministry credit for their good intentions. Provided the Cabinet displays adequate energy in purifying the administration, especially the prefects, and provided it adopts an anti-clerical policy, it will have the support of the Assembly.

In the previous Chamber the extreme republicans drew nearer to the moderates. The same took place in the country, and will go on in the present assembly. No doubt it has happened to minorities to find themselves transformed into majorities within a very short time, as was seen so often in the various assemblies of the Revolution. But at that time opinion and the current of things were as hostile to the government as to-day they are favourable to it. Need of change was as imperious then, as need of rest is now. This is why neither the Bonapartist minority nor the radical minority has a chance of arriving at a majority. Only violence and gross imprudences could strengthen Bonapartism in the country. M. Dupont White, an eminent publicist, thus sums up his optimistic views at the close of a letter addressed to the present writer: "The republican party augmented and strengthened as it is by so many monarchic auxiliaries, by so many considerable personages, might soon become what the Liberal party was under the Restoration; that is to say, serious, practical, re-assuring, capable, in short, of governing France as she needs to be governed for her own peace and that of Europe."

Romanism, that creed of concord and peace, has received a rude blow by the defeat of Don Carlos in Spain, and by the anti-clerical elections in France, but without allowing itself to feel a moment's discouragement, it strives its hardest wherever it preserves any influence to keep that privilege of persecuting dissidents which is one of its dogmas. In Spain the bishops threaten war against the government of King Alphonso, if it retains tolerance and freedom of worship. The ministry wavers. In the Tyrol, the central government had given leave to constitute protestant communes, and to erect a church destined for protestant service at Meran, where many Germans pass the winter. The diet has at once declared that its privileges are violated, and that the holy land of the Tyrol is profaned. Count Brandis even read so factious a declaration that the Emperor was forced to

close the provincial diet of the Tyrol. In Italy the ultramontane party is also making ready to descend into the arena and to present itself at the polls. But the Vatican hesitates, because it sees that the national sentiment is still too powerful to leave any chance of success to a faction whose avowed aim is to restore the temporal power and so to unmake Italy.

The Italian cabinet has announced a piece of good news to the country. For the first time the budget balances. The unpleasant situation of the treasury was the only dark spot in the serene sky of the Peninsula. If the country could obtain, as Minghetti says, a real surplus, and slightly diminish or at least redistribute the burden of taxation, Italy would find herself in a better condition than any other continental country. She has no desire to attack, and she ought no longer to fear attack herself, so long as the majority in France remains republican and anti-clerical. She might then dispense with the erection of fortresses that must be extremely useless in any case. Especially might she effect large savings in the navy. She has sold the best part of her fleet; let her abstain from replacing it. The recent discussions in England as to the value of ironclads prove that, thanks to the enormous and profound transformations in the naval material, the money devoted to them is as good as lost. All is at the mercy of a new torpedo, or a new system of ramming. Let Italy here imitate the United States, which are waiting until the great trial between armour-plating and cannon is definitively settled. Whatever Italy may do, the French navy will always be stronger than the Italian. Austria, on the other side, has not the least desire to re-occupy the Peninsula. If some day France were to invade Italy, she would do so by land. A serious attack by sea is scarcely possible, now that war is made by great masses, and Italy, when acting on the defensive disposes of the railways to effect a concentration of troops. It was possible to disembark a body of 20 or 30,000 men, when the enemy on land had no more than 100,000 for the whole force at his disposal. But by virtue of her new military organization Italy will have 700 or 800,000 men. Let her take care of this army, without raising the military estimates too high, but let her cut off all expenses on a navy and on fortresses. If besides retrenching her expenditure, she wishes to increase her resources, let her impose a heavy succession-duty, and suppress collateral successions beyond the fifth degree. A tax on successions is the least felt of all taxes, because it touches nobody when it is imposed, and only strikes at the moment when it is most easy to pay it. A Budget that would balance would be for Italy the final consecration of a solidly constituted nationality. Her enemies have always said that her finance would be her ruin. The recent announcement, if it comes to be realised, will do more than anything else to silence all anti-national intrigues.

The purchase of the railways by the State is a great economic question which engages both Germany and Italy at the same moment. In Germany their aim is strategic and political. They seek to turn the iron roads into instruments of war in the hands of the Head-Quarters Staff, and an agency of centralisation in the hands of the Empire. The railways of Alsace-Lorraine are already worked by the imperial administration; they

wish to extend the same system to the whole German network. There are on all these lines places to give away by thousands. By giving them to partisans of German unity and the central government, they form in innumerable centres, wherever there is a station, a focus of centralist propagandism. In Italy the aim is partly of the same kind. But they are also naturally anxious to withdraw from the hands of a foreign company the lines of Upper Italy which command the entrance of the kingdom.

Apart from all other economic and political arguments for and against the ownership of railways by a government, we cannot deny—whether this be good or bad—that it is an application of Socialism. The business of a railway is perhaps the most difficult of all businesses. It asks for technical, administrative, legal, financial, knowledge of the most accurate sort. Every day it is necessary to resolve the most delicate problems connected with the maintenance of the permanent way, the system of locomotives, the condition of the rolling stock, the fares and rates. The responsibility is of the gravest. If therefore the State carries on the railways with success, when it has the monopoly of them in its hands, then it is evident that it would manage even more readily and successfully coal mines, metalliferous mines, and forests, (as the Prussian government does); that it could also manufacture tobacco, sugar, wrought iron: in a word could carry on all the great industries. Germany, Belgium and Italy, are entering on this path by monopolising all the iron roads. Have the Statesmen who take the initiative in this measure foreseen, and deliberately faced its consequences, or are we to see in it a sign of the times, and a proof that, as the *Katheder-Socialisten* maintain in Germany, the part of state-intervention will go on steadily increasing, instead of diminishing into non-existence, as was so willingly believed not long ago? A grave question, which we shall not attempt to answer here.

In the East, Austria seems to have decided to act energetically to prevent foreign succour from penetrating into Herzegovina. Will this be enough to bring about the submission of the insurgents, and will they succeed in hindering Servia from taking a part in the struggle? It is to be hoped so, for the sake of avoiding further shedding of blood. Russia desires an end to the insurrection, because she is not really prepared to derive any advantage from action in this quarter. But the reforms imposed upon the Turks, if they are carried into execution, will hasten the fall of their power. What makes progressive peoples advance, kills peoples that are stationary. Credit which has fertilised western Europe is the plague of Turkey and Egypt, because it is applied to over-stimulate unproductive expenditure. The railways that the Porte has constructed at immense sacrifice, will enrich the rayahs, the Christians, the rural Slavic populations; they will place all these in direct relation with their brethren of Austria, and will contribute powerfully to fortify the sentiment of nationality. The more the subject populations become civilised, the less disposed will they be to support the yoke of the Turk. The railway is so powerful an instrument of progress that before many years it will end in the emancipation of the Balkan peninsula.

March 27, 1876.

THE  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

No. CXIII. NEW SERIES.—MAY 1, 1876.

THE RIGHT METHOD WITH THE PUBLICANS.

It is noteworthy in a time which is described as one of political apathy by those who certainly do their best to make politics dull, that one great question at least retains its hold on public attention, and excites an ever growing and deepening interest. The continued spread of intemperance is the most important single cause of the misery and suffering still rife in our midst, and there are few who would now gainsay the assertion of Mr. Cobden, made many years back, that "the temperance cause lies at the foundation of all social and political reform." This fact, indeed, has become so apparent to those engaged in any kind of public, religious, or philanthropic work, that earnest men find it impossible to rest and be thankful, and even professional optimists confess the hopelessness of repose, while this hateful pest is present to disturb the tenour of complacent dreams.

At the last general election the subject assumed unusual prominence. The members of the threatened trade, for the first time in our political history, descended in a body into the arena and joined their forces to those of the Conservatives, who were thus enabled to gain an easy victory. The assistance so rendered has since been cheaply rewarded by a small extension of the hours of drinking. Notwithstanding the greatness of the service, this was the utmost concession that public opinion, and the conscience of their own followers, would suffer the government to make. The publicans are beginning to discover that, as far as their special interests are concerned, there is only half-an-hour's difference between one political party and the other.

There was some talk at one time of an alliance between the publicans and the parsons; but whatever political schemers may have desired, the thing is impossible, unless the publicans will play the part of the dwarf in the story, and bear the brunt of the contest without sharing the honour or the spoils of victory. Within the last



few months, three bishops have publicly joined the United Kingdom Alliance, and more than four thousand of the clergy have memorialised the episcopal bench against the growing abuse of intoxicating liquors. It is even more significant of the present drift of public opinion, that the *Quarterly Review* has republished the facts and statistics, which for some time past have formed the indictment prepared by the temperance reformers against the drink traffic, and has concluded in favour of the abolition of all beer-shops, and the reduction of the number of public-houses: while, under a Tory government, and in the present Beer Parliament, no less than eight separate Bills have been introduced from different sides of the House for the further regulation and restriction of the liquor trade. Under these circumstances it cannot be regarded as impossible that the two great political parties should unite to arrest the growing evil which is even now the curse of the country, the disgrace of our boasted civilisation, and the despair of our social reformers; or, if this be too much to expect of the patriotism of the Tories, it is at least probable that the Liberals, indignant at the attitude of selfish hostility assumed by the trade, and weary of the degradations involved in futile attempts at conciliation, may declare war to the knife against this swollen tyranny. In such a case the Conservative tenure of office may be lengthened a little, but sooner or later the inevitable swing of the pendulum will once more restore their opponents to place and power.

The contingency, however distant, cannot be contemplated with satisfaction by the menaced interest, and all sensible well-wishers to the trade must desire to see some *modus in quo* adopted, some solution of the problem accepted, whereby the publicans may be relieved from anxiety, the wicked cease from troubling and the weary be at rest. Is it altogether impossible to find some means of preventing the abuse of strong drink, without arbitrary interference with individual liberty, and without palpable injustice to those who have embarked their fortunes in the trade?

There is little need to dwell on the acknowledged evils which attend on the present state of things. A perfect cloud of witnesses, including judges, magistrates, ministers of religion, medical men, governors of gaols, and masters of workhouses, concur in attributing a large proportion of the ignorance, pauperism, disease, and crime, by which the country is desolated, to the intemperate habits of the people. It is true that Mr. Arthur Bass, M.P., speaking at a Licensed Victuallers' dinner, on behalf of what he called the "just, righteous, and reasonable privileges" of the trade, asserted that the evils of drunkenness were exaggerated, and that the movement for its suppression began at the wrong end. His argument is at least more reasonable than the statement of his father, the member for Derby, that more evil results from over-eating than from over-

drinking, but it is not sustained by the testimony of more disinterested witnesses. These tell us that education is hindered when the parents drink the children's schooling; that nearly every case of destitution is distinctly traceable to intemperance; that crime almost invariably follows or accompanies intoxication; and that drink slays more victims than the direst pestilence or most disastrous war. Drink is the national crime, and it is one of its greatest terrors that it grows with the increasing prosperity of the country, and leaves us little room for rejoicing in what ought to be the subject of unmingled congratulation. In the last three years of great commercial activity, the consumption of excisable liquors has increased 25 per cent., and the reported cases of drunkenness more than 50 per cent. The expenditure on intoxicants already exceeds £120,000,000; it has increased, is increasing, and assuredly ought to be diminished.

All past legislation has been ineffectual to restrain the habit of excess. Acts of Parliament intended to lessen have notoriously augmented the evil; and we must seek a remedy in some new direction, if we are not prepared to abandon the contest, or contentedly to watch with folded arms the gradual deterioration of the people.

Restriction, in the forms which it has hitherto assumed, of shorter hours, more stringent regulations of licensed houses, and magisterial control of licenses, has been a conspicuous failure. For a short time after the passing of Lord Aberdare's Act, hopes were entertained of great results from the provisions for early closing, and many chief constables testified to the improved order of the streets under their charge; but it soon appeared that the limitation, while it lessened the labours of the police, and advanced their duties an hour or so in the night, was not sufficient to reduce materially the quantity of liquor consumed, or the consequent amount of drunkenness.

A comparison between the three years, 1869 to 1871, preceding the passing of the Licensing Amendment Act, 1872, and the three years, 1873 to 1875, when the shorter hours were in force, gives the following result in the towns named:—

	No. of cases drunk, and drunk and disorderly. 1st Period.	No. of cases. 2nd Period.
Chester . . . .	1,261	1,401
Hull . . . .	2,457	3,970
Birmingham . . . .	6,464	7,208
Liverpool . . . .	58,975	60,062

And similar results are recorded in the majority of boroughs.

In like manner, the provisions which were intended by Lord Aberdare to secure the respectable conduct of licensed houses have

certainly not effected their object. The clauses against the practice of supplying drunken persons with drink, and against gaming in public-houses, are nearly inoperative. In 1873, according to the return obtained by Mr. Rathbone, there were in England and Wales only 3,871 convictions of licensed persons, against 116,149 licenses in force, and 178,783 convictions for drunkenness. In other words, the total convictions against licensed persons were only as 1 to 46 of the convictions for drunkenness, and yet it is certain that a large number of the persons convicted for drunkenness must have had liquor supplied to them against the terms of the Act. The proportion above stated does not represent the whole case, as the immense majority of convictions against licensed houses are for keeping open during prohibited hours. Thus in Birmingham, out of one hundred and six keepers of public-houses and beer-shops proceeded against in the twelve months ending December 31, 1875, only six were summoned for permitting drunkenness and supplying drunken persons with drink, two were proceeded against for allowing gaming, and eighty-nine for keeping open in improper hours.

It is clear, therefore, that these clauses are likely to be almost a dead letter unless special activity is used to enforce them. The Watch Committee of the Town Council of Birmingham—finding that drunkenness was by far the most frequent offence in the force under their control, and that while they were compelled weekly to fine and dismiss constables for intoxication while on duty, the persons supplying them with drink escaped undetected and unpunished,—determined in February last to appoint five special inspectors, carefully selected and highly paid, to see that the provisions of the Licensing Acts were carried out in the borough. Already this appointment has resulted in the prosecution of twenty licensed persons in two months for supplying drunken people and police constables on duty with drink, and for permitting gaming, against ten, the total number proceeded against for these offences in 1875. But the action of the Watch Committee has roused the bitter hostility of the publicans, who have held indignation meetings, and formed an electoral association to secure the return to the Town Council of representatives pledged to the support of the “righteous privilege” of the liquor-seller to set the law at defiance. In boroughs where parties are evenly divided, it is too much to expect that either side will incur the reprobation of a powerful trade which furnishes one householder to every thirty, and each member of which boasts that he can bring five voters to the poll.

The powers possessed by the licensing justices are much less extended than is generally imagined. The advocates of the Permissive Bill frequently infer from the fact that each license is granted only for a year, that its renewal is optional; but the truth is, that

the license, once granted, becomes in the present state of the law a lease with perpetual renewal, subject only to the payment of the license duty, and moderately good conduct.

With great inconsistency the law, while prohibiting a county justice from taking part in the borough licensing sessions, presumably on the ground of want of local knowledge, gives an appeal to the Quarter Sessions of the County against the refusal of the borough justices to renew a license, and the decisions of the borough justices have been quashed again and again by the county sessions, where the county magistrates have chosen to assume that the proof of flagrant misconduct was insufficient. If the practice of giving appeal jurisdiction to one set of unpaid magistrates over the decisions of an equally competent court is to continue in this case, it would be well, at least, to extend the principle, and to give an appeal to the borough bench against the decisions of county justices in Game Law and similar proceedings.

The one effective power possessed by licensing justices is the discretion vested in them to refuse, without appeal, applications for new licenses, and this has been used in many places of late years, although not to an extent sufficient to produce any marked effect. And even in this matter no power is reserved to the justices in the case of applications to sell off the premises, except where the applicant is of known bad character. Thus, in Birmingham, since 1870, only six new licenses have been granted by the magistrates to licensed victuallers, while in the same period one hundred and seventeen licenses have been granted to beer-shops, chiefly to sell off the premises. The chief constable of Gateshead reports that the increase of intemperance in his borough is largely due to the existence and number of these licenses.

In another respect the licensing law is defective, inasmuch as it is doubtful how far the justices have any control over extensions of premises which may entirely alter the character of the business conducted therein. In all the large towns the recent enormous gains of the traffic have led to a rapid process of conversion, under which old-fashioned, respectable inns and public-houses have been transformed into flaming gin-palaces, with all the latest attractions of plate-glass and gilding. The decision of the Brewster Sessions in some boroughs not to grant renewals in flagrant instances of this kind of substitution has been reversed on appeal, and it is very desirable that their discretion should be extended in this direction.

While it is more than doubtful whether the restrictions imposed on publicans have promoted the respectability of the trade, or tended in the slightest degree to check the immoderate use of stimulants, it is certain that the penalties inflicted for drunkenness are powerless against the temptations to excess so lavishly supplied.

The following two cases extracted from the Report of the chief constable of Rochdale, for the year 1873, might be supplemented by thousands of similar returns from the police statistics of every town in the kingdom.

HABITUAL DRUNKARD (FEMALE)—20 YEARS OF AGE.

Date.	Offence.	How dealt with.
23rd Dec., 1872.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	Cautioned and discharged
25th Dec., 1872.	Drunk and using obscene language . . .	10s. 6d. or 14 days' Imprisonment
13th Jan., 1873.	Drunk and refusing to quit public house . . .	21s. or 1 month's do.
28th Feb., 1873.	Drunk and obscene language . . .	21s. or 1 month's do.
31st Mar., 1873.	Drunkenness . . .	21s. or 1 month's do.
9th May, 1873.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	21s. or 1 month's do.
20th June, 1873.	Drunk and obscene language . . .	21s. or 1 month's do.
22nd Aug., 1873.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	21s. or 1 month's do.
26th Sep., 1873.	Drunk and obscene language . . .	Cautioned and discharged

The statistical year ends on the 29th of September. Since the last conviction quoted in the above table, she has been four times in custody for drunkenness, and at the present time is undergoing a term of imprisonment for an offence against the Vagrant Act.

HABITUAL DRUNKARD (MALE)—25 YEARS OF AGE.

Date.	Offence.	How dealt with. ;
25th Oct., 1872.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	10s. 6d. and costs, or 14 days
8th Nov., 1872.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	10s. 6d. and costs, or 14 days
24th Mar., 1873.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	21s. and costs, or 1 month
7th May, 1873.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	10s. 6d. and costs, or 14 days
2nd June, 1873.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	40s. and costs, or 1 month
14th July, 1873.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	40s. and costs, or 1 month
15th Aug., 1873.	Drunk and disorderly . . .	40s. and costs, or 1 month

This man has been twenty times in custody for drunkenness.

According to Mr. Rathbone's Return for 1873, of the 178,783 convictions registered 12,253 were known to be second convictions, and to treat this recurrent disease as a crime is hardly more reasonable than the practice of the inhabitants of Erewhon, who imprisoned a man for catching cold, and considered typhus fever as the basest of crimes.

Before proceeding farther it will be well to consider briefly the principal suggestions for further legislation, which have been offered as palliatives or remedies for the evil we are discussing.

The simplest of these is the proposal of Mr. Cowen, the member for Newcastle-on-Tyne, to transfer the powers possessed by the magistrates in licensing matters to a Licensing Board, specially elected for the purpose. Except in the abolition of the present appeal to an inferior court, the Bill makes no alteration whatever in the amount of control given, it only changes the authority by which the control is to be exercised. No important result is therefore to be expected from the measure, except the bare admission of the principle that the ratepayers have a right to be represented in the settlement of this question. This is no doubt a vital point, and its acceptance would probably lead to ultimate developments of the principle which would advance very considerably the solution of the whole problem; but the same result may be secured by other machinery, and there is an objection *in limine* to Mr. Cowen's proposal, which it is to be hoped will prove fatal. Local government will hardly stand the strain of another new and independent local authority, with a separate election, and all its consequent cost and disturbance. Already in many boroughs there are elections and polls for almost every month in the year, and if this state of things continues or is extended, it will be almost impossible to secure a healthy interest in any one of them. There are already in parliamentary and municipal boroughs separate elections of town councillors, of auditors and assessors, of the School Board and board of guardians, and of members of Parliament, and there are in addition occasional polls of ratepayers, under the provisions of the Borough Funds' Act.

The most fanatical admirer of the great constitutional spectacle of—

“The freeman casting with unpurchased hand  
The vote that shakes the turrets of the land”

must feel that this perpetual repetition of the process will render even turrets indifferent to shaking. Besides this, the multiplication of authorities and the subdivision of their powers tend to lessen their importance, to deteriorate the character of their members, and to weaken the interest taken in their proceedings. The election for a Licensing Board would degenerate into a contest between the publicans and the teetotallers in each community, and a large proportion of the electors would stand aloof, just as even now in some places a different class of persons vote for the Town Council, the School Board, and the Board of Guardians respectively. If any power in Licensing questions is to be entrusted to a representative body it is essential that the body chosen should be one of the authorities already existing, and the most important of them. In this way only will the whole of the active and public-spirited portion of the constituency participate in the selection of representatives, and the best and ablest citizens be attracted to the work; and in this way only will

the selfishness of trade interests or the fanaticism of enthusiasts be counterbalanced by the good sense and patriotism of the majority.

A similar objection, so far as concerns the new occasion for taking a separate vote of the ratepayers, applies to the measure known as the Permissive Bill. This might, however, be easily obviated by an amendment substituting the vote of the Town Council, or some other existing local authority, for the sort of plebiscite which the Bill now contemplates as the method by which the wishes of each district are to be made known. But more serious objections remain to be considered.

It is alleged, in the first place, that the total prohibition of the public sale of intoxicating liquors is an intolerable interference with individual liberty; but it must be observed that this argument can only be employed by those who are ready to accept the theory of Free Trade in drink. Mr. Mill has pointed out that the limitation of licenses with a view to render the houses more difficult of access, and the levy of a duty in order to increase cost, and thereby diminish consumption, differ only in degree, and not in principle, from total prohibition; and accordingly they are equally condemned by him. But those who advocate these and similar restrictions, who approve of legislation against gambling houses, and are willing to prohibit the public sale of poisons, are clearly inconsistent in disputing the principle of the Permissive Bill, though they may still question its policy and machinery. As to these, it is often stated, and seems to be generally supposed, that the Bill would transfer the entire control of licenses to the householders in each district, but the measure is really much more limited in its scope than this description would imply. It provides that, on the request of a number of the householders in a district to the chief officer of the parish or district, the votes of the ratepayers shall be taken as to the propriety of adopting the provisions of the Act; but that a majority of at least two-thirds of the votes taken shall be necessary in order to decide that question in the affirmative. The Act itself would, when once adopted, prohibit within that district all traffic in intoxicating liquor for common purposes, as the magistrates would then be compelled to refuse the renewal of all licenses at the end of the year for which they were granted.

Now, one objection to this proposal is that while it adopts the principle of local option and popular control, it limits this control and restricts the option to only one of the many issues that might be and ought to be raised. The majority of districts and probably the whole of the large towns are unprepared for the entire prohibition of the sale of drink, though willing and even anxious to reduce it to more moderate limits. In all such cases the Act would be a dead letter; the evils of the trade would be untouched, and the state of things

would remain for an indefinite time as bad as before the passing of the Bill. It might even be worse, for the effect of a large majority against the Bill would be to strengthen the hands of the trade, and possibly to influence those justices, who have been pursuing a policy of restriction and refusing new licenses, to take a different view of their duty. The great number of respectable and intelligent persons who favour restriction, but are disinclined to abolition, would have no opportunity whatever of expressing their real opinions, and the only people actually consulted would be the respective partisans of the United Kingdom Alliance, and of Free Trade in Drink.

Another objection to Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Bill is that it makes no provision for compensating those whose existing means of livelihood it proposes to destroy. It is not likely that the general feeling of the country will ever accept such a proposal as equitable and right. We have compensated every conceivable interest in this country, whenever the well-being of the community has necessitated interference. We compensated proctors for abandoning their privilege of delay in legal procedure: we compensated the officers of the army for surrendering the admittedly illegal system of purchase: we compensated the Rev. Thomas Thurlow to the tune of nearly £400,000 for the loss of his sinecures as Prothonotary and Hamper Keeper: we compensated the Deputy Chaff-Wax when we relieved him from his absurd and useless functions: we are actually at this day compensating the heirs of a man who died two hundred years ago, for his losses in the service of the most profligate monarch our country has ever known. What have the publicans done that they are to be ruthlessly excluded from all participation in the golden shower which descends in this country on the heads of all who contrive to make themselves a nuisance to the community, or to block the way to further progress? Their case is the more entitled to consideration, because they may plausibly urge that they have been tempted into the trade by past legislation, while many of them can show that they have bought with hard cash their share of that monopoly, licensed by the State, of which it is now proposed to deprive them.

The Alliance itself seems to recognise at least the probable necessity of some compromise in this respect. In a statement issued Jan. 17th, 1870, Mr. Barker, the Secretary, says, "if Mr. Bright, or any other statesman, can convince the House of Commons and the country that the liquor traffickers, who are only permitted, from year to year, under numerous restrictions, to sell at certain times, by the clock, under the surveillance of the police, have acquired a right to sell till doomsday, and that, therefore, they have an indisputable claim to have their vested interests protected by the law against the will and the interests of the community, Sir Wilfrid Lawson and his friends will, of course, bow to



the decision of Parliament in its wisdom." Mr. Bright and the other statesmen referred to will have little difficulty in establishing the sort of claim required. The annual renewal of licenses is now a solemn farce, as recent legal decisions clearly show that the magistrates have no power to refuse renewal except in some well-defined and rather extreme cases of misconduct, and under these circumstances every reasonable man must make compensation an element in every proposal to abolish, or compulsorily to diminish, the licenses now in existence.

Two other Bills, the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, and the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), propose to prohibit, for the whole country, and for Ireland respectively, the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday. These measures enlist the support of the Sabbatarian party, as well as of temperance advocates, but it cannot be denied that they would inflict a certain amount of hardship on the working-classes, and would be, in the first instance, at all events, extremely unpopular.

It is difficult to see how they can be logically defended by any but the thorough-going prohibitionists, and their acceptance will be a distinct admission of the right of the majority to abolish altogether the traffic in liquor. But even then it would seem that, if the diminution of intemperance is the main object, the wrong day has been selected for the experiment in prohibition. The returns of drunkenness show that the number of apprehensions for this offence is less than the average on Sunday, and greatest on Saturday, which is the usual pay-day and half-holiday in all the manufacturing districts. The following return shows the comparative numbers in some of the principal towns:—

TABLE SHOWING AMOUNT OF DRUNKENNESS ON SATURDAY AND SUNDAY, AND TOTAL DRUNKENNESS, FOR A PERIOD OF TWELVE MONTHS IN THE FOLLOWING TOWNS.

Towns.	Total Drunkenness in Twelve Months.	Drunkenness on Saturdays.	Drunkenness on Sundays.
Birmingham . .	2,434	678	323
Bradford . . .	979	316	119
Hull . . . . .	1,162	319	111
Leeds . . . . .	2,201	770	138
Manchester . . .	10,553	3,216	1,601

The police statistics of Manchester give the number of apprehensions for different periods of the day and night, and from this it appears that of the drunkenness attributed to Sunday more than one half, or 822 cases, occurred between twelve on Saturday night and two on Sunday morning, and are, therefore, due to Saturday's

drinking, and not properly debited to Sunday. The number taken up between the same hours on Monday morning was only 106. It is probable that similar results would be obtained by a detailed examination of the statistics of other boroughs.

In opposition to these various proposals for restriction, an old theory has lately been revived, and supported by much new wealth of argument and statistics, in favour of Free Trade in Drink. "A Magistrate," writing to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, has attempted to prove that intemperance exists in inverse proportion to the number of public-houses, and that the greater the facilities the less will be the temptation. An examination of the return on which this anomalous proposition is based will show the very slight foundation on which the theory has been erected, and the untrustworthy character of the incomplete figures which at first sight may have seemed to justify this strange conclusion. A comparison is instituted between thirty boroughs having the largest proportion of licensed houses to the population, and thirty boroughs at the other end of the scale with the smallest proportionate number of licenses, and the result is stated to be, that whereas in the first case there is an average of one licensed house to 86 inhabitants, and an average of one apprehension for drunkenness to 164 inhabitants; in the second group there is only one license to 352 inhabitants, but the apprehensions average one to 75. In the counties the results are stated to be similar. Mr. W. S. Caine, himself a magistrate of Liverpool, has, however, pointed out that in the first group of boroughs the total population is only 228,582, the average being 7,617 inhabitants to each, while in the second group, which comprises London, Liverpool, Leeds, Salford, and Bradford, the population is 5,741,253, or an average of 191,375.

It is clear that the results obtained from such a comparison are really incommensurable, and Mr. Caine indicates the circumstances (not taken into account by "A Magistrate") which are the natural explanation of the excessive proportion of drunkenness in the larger towns.

"The first group," he says, "are all market towns, whither resort once a week all the farmers for miles round, wanting accommodation for man and beast. By far the larger number of these licensed houses derive their whole trade from this weekly influx of surrounding population, and are mostly very small houses, with very large back-yards and roomy stables. The proprietors of these little publicans are most of them engaged in other trades, and could not make a living out of their one day's liquor trade in the week.

"Compare these village pothouses with the licensed houses in the other group—the gin-palaces of London, Liverpool, or Leeds. Sandwich, the leader of the first group, has 165 licensed houses to a population of 3,060. I have no doubt whatever that, take the year through, there is more liquor sold at the Alhambra, in Leicester Square, than in the whole of these 165 little village houses. Can anything be more preposterous than an argument based on the relative

number of public-houses in Sandwich and the metropolis, or Bewdley and Liverpool? Yet this is what 'A Magistrate' has done."

As regards the counties, Mr. Caine points out that the first group in the comparison is purely agricultural, while the second comprises all the great manufacturing counties, including Lancashire, Yorkshire, Staffordshire, Durham, and Glamorganshire; and he adds a comparison of his own, between the ten soberest counties and boroughs and the ten most drunken, which exactly reverses the conclusions arrived at by "A Magistrate," though there is no reason to believe that the figures by themselves are more trustworthy in the one case than in the other. For even if we attempt to establish a comparison between places of similar size and character, we shall find that the official returns of drunkenness are absolutely misleading, and that a selection may easily be made by which either view of the consequences of restriction may, in appearance, be justified.

This is exhibited in the following tables:—

TABLE I.

Places.	Population to each License.	Population to each case of Drunkenness.
Huddersfield .	224	159
Birmingham .	192	137
Preston . .	185	100
Derby . . .	166	71
Manchester .	162	33
Durham . .	150	23

In the above table drunkenness decreases with the diminution in the number of licensed houses; while the reverse is the case in

TABLE II.

Places.	Population to each License.	Population to each case of Drunkenness.
Birkenhead	230	34
Halifax	217	75
Oldham	207	83
Blackburn	181	111
Bradford	178	159
Sheffield	172	218

A further examination of the statistics brings to light anomalies which are difficult to explain, and which serve only to show that no trustworthy conclusions can be drawn from such comparisons.

The manufacturing towns of Lancashire are situated within a few miles of one another. They have the same staple industry, the same class of population, and the same climate. Yet Manchester, with one license to 162 of the population, has nearly three times the drunken-

ness of Bolton, with one license to 96. Rochdale has the same proportion of licenses as Stockport, and three times as many cases of drunkenness. Blackburn has ten per cent. more licenses than Rochdale, and less than one-third the drunkenness, and so on. Of Yorkshire towns, Dewsbury has more than twice the drunkenness of Leeds, with about the same number of licenses to population; Huddersfield has only half the drunkenness of Halifax, with nearly the same proportion of licenses; while Sheffield and Bradford, equally supplied with licenses, are as three to four in the number of their drunken cases. Of seaport towns, Liverpool, with one license to 216 population, has one case of drunkenness to 22 inhabitants; Hull, with six per cent. greater proportion of licenses, has only one-fifth the drunkenness; Plymouth, ten per cent. more licenses, and one-ninth the drunkenness; Bristol, thirty per cent. more licenses, and one-seventh the drunkenness; while Portsmouth, with forty-five per cent. greater facilities for drinking, returns only one-fiftieth the number of drunken cases.

To sum up, a diagram showing the results in the fifty most populous English towns, excluding the metropolis, and arranged according to the proportion of licenses in each, exhibits a gradual reduction from one in 315 to one in 114 of the population, while the line which represents the number of drunken cases is a zig-zag, crossing backwards and forwards from the top of the page to the bottom, and representing variations from one in 22 to one in 484 of the inhabitants.

It has been said that these extraordinary divergences are difficult to explain. They may be partially accounted for by the very different view of what constitutes drunkenness which obtains in different boroughs, and which varies from time to time with the composition of the Bench and the Watch Committee, and with the character of the chief constable and the police force. But besides this, it is clear that there are many factors to the problem in addition to the number of licenses. Climate, the rate of wages, the state of trade, the nature of the employment, the hours of work, and other considerations must be taken into account and allowed for before any useful comparison can be made. The argument for Free Trade in drink must therefore stand or fall on its own merits, and cannot be sustained by statistics so variable and anomalous as the official returns of the cases of drunkenness reported by the police. If pure reason will not bring the conviction that the greater the facilities for drinking the less will be the consumption of drink, it will be useless to appeal to the statistics to establish the paradox.

A Bill, bearing the title of the Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland) Bill, has been introduced by Sir Robert Anstruther. It applies to Scotland only, and its main object is to suspend the issue of all

licenses till the number has been reduced to one in 500 of the population in towns, and to one in 300 in the country districts. No new grocers' licenses are to be granted after the passing of this Act. Another Bill with similar object, but applying to the whole country, and called the Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Law Amendment) Bill, has been brought in by Sir Harcourt Johnstone and Mr. Birley.

The return presented to Parliament on the motion of Mr. Bright shows that the present proportion of licenses to population in cities and boroughs in England and Wales is one in 173, and the number must, therefore, be reduced 66 per cent. before the limit contemplated by Sir R. Anstruther's Bill is attained. In Birmingham the diminution in the number of licenses from withdrawals, forfeitures, town improvements, and other causes has been rather less than ten per cent. in six years; while the new licenses granted during the same period have been about  $8\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. Supposing the issue of fresh licenses to be suspended, and that the causes which tend to reduction in Birmingham apply equally in other towns, it would appear that about forty years must elapse before the number of licensed houses in England and Wales would be diminished to the extent suggested in the measure under consideration. The growth in population has not been taken into account in the foregoing estimate, but as the percentage of annual reduction would decline as the licenses become fewer, and the monopoly more valuable, the terms named, even with this allowance, would, in all probability, be largely exceeded.

It can hardly be asserted, therefore, that such a proposal offers any satisfactory solution of the problem before us. It is, however, all that remains of two much more comprehensive measures, also introduced by Sir R. Anstruther, in 1872 and 1874 respectively, and in which provision was made for the election, under certain conditions, of a Licensing Board, with power to take existing licenses (in 1872 compulsorily on payment of compensation fixed by the Act, and in 1874 by agreement with the owners), and to carry on the trade for the benefit of the local authority. These two Bills were avowedly based on the experience of what is called the Gothenburg system, the results of which merit a detailed examination, and afford most important and valuable lessons to English temperance reformers.

At the outset it is necessary to bear in mind the general condition of things in Sweden which led to the experimental legislation now under review. Up to 1855 there was Free Trade in liquor in Sweden: every person in the kingdom had the right of selling spirits in quantities of one *kan* (three-fifths of a gallon) and upwards, and every burgher was entitled to sell in any quantity, large or small. The consequences may be commended to the careful consideration

of those who urge the adoption of a similar principle in this country. There existed in 1850 more than 40,000 distilleries of "bränvin"—Swedish brandy with 50 per cent. of alcohol—alone, and innumerable shops for the sale of this spirit, and of ale and porter. The consumption reached an average of ten gallons per annum per head of the population, which may be compared with the estimated consumption of  $1\frac{1}{4}$  gallons per annum per head of the population of the United Kingdom. So prevalent is still the excessive use of bränvin in Sweden, that the Swedes appear to consider the milder intoxicants unworthy of notice in their legislation for limiting the abuse of strong drinks, and houses for the sale of porter, wine, and beer only are styled "Temperance Houses" in contrast to the spirit shops; but in 1855 the Diet passed a law prohibiting private distillation altogether, fixing the minimum quantity to be sold without license at 15 kans, and authorising the communal authorities to recommend the number of licenses, if any, to be granted in their respective districts. The governor of each province was empowered to diminish, but not to increase, the number so recommended, which were then put up to auction for a term of three years. In many localities the communal authorities have availed themselves of the discretion vested in them to report against any licenses being granted, and thus the principle of the Permissive Bill has been practically put into operation.

Taking advantage of some of the provisions of this general law, a limited company, called the "Utskänknings-aktie Bolag," was formed in Gothenburg in 1865, whose members bound themselves by charter to derive no profit from the trade in drink which the company was instituted to carry on, but to hand over the net proceeds, if any, to the town treasury. The fundamental principle of their operations was stated to be that no individual, either as proprietor or manager, under a public-house license, should derive any private gain from the sale of spirits, or have any interest whatever in extending their consumption. At the time of their incorporation there were in Gothenburg sixty-one public-house licenses granted by the Town Council for the sale of any quantity of spirits to be consumed off or on the premises, and fifty-eight retail licenses (or grocers' licenses, as they would be called in England), for the sale of quantities not less than half a kan to be consumed off the premises. The latter were excluded from the provisions of the law affecting public-house licenses, and in the first instance the Bolag was only able to secure a transfer of the forty public-house licenses which were then open for renewal. Of this number they abandoned seventeen at once, and placed managers in the rest, who are paid partly by salary and partly by a share of the profits on the sale of beer, coffee, tea, tobacco, and food. In 1868 the Bolag completed the acquisition of

the whole of the remaining twenty-one spirit shops under the control of the council, and of these they have subsequently abandoned three, having now forty-one in operation. In 1875, by an alteration in the law, they were enabled to obtain possession of the retail licenses also, of which there were then only twenty in existence, the others having been abandoned from time to time by the authorities. Of the twenty so obtained the Bolag suppressed seven altogether, and transferred the remainder to private wine merchants for the sale of the higher class of spirits not in ordinary use by the working classes.

On taking to their property the Bolag seems to have made considerable alterations in the houses, which are now said to be plain and quiet in exterior, with none of the flashy adornment by which the proprietors of gin-palaces in this country seek to attract their victims. Mr. Balfour, of Liverpool, who visited Gothenburg in 1875, reports as follows on this subject:—

“We visited numbers of the public-houses, and found they were fitted up comfortably, and more resembled eating houses than the public-houses of our own country. They were provided with a bar, on which were placed several small glasses filled with spirits. But for this, we probably should not have discovered that we were within a public-house at all; and there was no such thing as the blazing gas, the mirrors, the brass, and the lines of bottles that so ostentatiously distinguish the gin-palaces of England. . . . We observed a striking contrast between these public-houses and our own in this respect—that at Gothenburg the people were almost all taking food, showing that the purpose steadily pursued by the company of transforming public-houses into eating-houses is being largely accomplished.”

The effect on drunkenness of these continued operations is shown by the following Table:—

Year.	Cases of Drunkenness.	Per Cent. to Population.	Number of Licenses.		Remarks.
			Public-houses.	Grocers.	
1864	2,161	6·10	61	58	Bolag began 1st October.
1865	2,070	5·57	41	40	
1866	1,424	3·75	44	40	
1867	1,375	3·58	44	40	
1868	1,320	3·50	43	40	
1869	1,445	2·56	43	40	Bad harvest.
1870	1,416	2·52	43	40	Ditto.
1871	1,531	2·67	43	40	Ditto.
1872	1,581	2·72	42	30	
1873	1,827	3·21	42	25	Very good harvest.
1874	2,234	3·83	41	25	Ditto.
1875	2,300	3·83	41	13	Ditto.

In addition to the licenses mentioned above, there appear to be 9 which have been granted for life or in perpetuity, and which the Bolag has consequently been unable to obtain; and there are also 115 licenses for the sale of beer and porter. Two conclusions

must be drawn from these statistics: the one that since the formation of the Bolag, the ordinary level of drunkenness has been reduced nearly forty per cent., and the other, that the progress made has not been continuous, or in recent years satisfactory to the promoters of the experiment. It is important to discover if possible the causes of the slight increase in drunkenness since 1870, concurrent as it is with considerable further reduction in the total number of licenses. Amongst those suggested are the following: 1st. The rise and progress of the practice of "salning," which is the clubbing together of a number of consumers, to purchase the minimum quantity allowed to be sold wholesale for consumption off the premises. Within the last few months this minimum has been greatly increased, and it is hoped that a corresponding improvement in the returns may follow. 2nd. The extraordinary harvests of the last few years have been accompanied by a rise in wages equal, it is said, to 50 per cent., and the expenditure of the working classes on luxuries has augmented in consequence. In Stockholm the same cause, untempered by the existence of such an organization as the Bolag, has produced a very much larger increase in the number of cases of drunkenness. 3rd. It is alleged that the Bolag has not been quite successful in excluding its managers from all pecuniary interest in the sale. An allowance is made to them of 3 per cent. for leakage and waste, and this being in excess of the real average, leaves a margin of profit which augments with the quantity sold. Lastly, it is suggested by Bailie Lewis, of Edinburgh, who visited Sweden in 1873, in order to investigate the results of the system, that the profits derived by the town through the instrumentality of the Bolag (which were £10,604 in 1871, and have risen to £36,973 in 1875) have tended to reconcile the community to the continued prosecution, and even to the extension of the traffic. We are said to have drunk ourselves out of the Abyssinian War, and in a similar way the drinkers of Gothenburg provide for many of the expenses of the community. Under these circumstances it is suggested that drinking becomes invested with the character of a public duty, and a faint glamour of patriotism envelops the trade and all its incidents.

"Drink and be mad then; 'tis your country bids:  
Gloriously drunk, obey the important call!  
Her cause demands the assistance of your throats,  
Ye all can swallow, and she asks no more."

This insinuation of indifference to the evil is, however, strenuously repelled by the members of the Bolag and the leading inhabitants of the town, and it appears that with a view of lessening any possible temptation to the municipal authorities to encourage the sale of drink in order to increase their revenue, the law of 1874 has given



two-fifths of all net profit made in the town by the Bolag to the authorities of the county or province for their benefit, and that of the agricultural society. Local opinion seems unanimously in favour of the system after ten years experience, and similar organizations have been formed on the model of the Bolag in several Norwegian and Swedish towns, while a committee of the Town Council of Stockholm has just recommended the adoption of the plan in the capital itself.

The standing difficulty of the friends of temperance in these countries is the excessive cheapness of spirits, which are even now sold wholesale at 2s. 9d. per gallon, and retail, by the glass, at the rate of 6s. per gallon. In Christiania, where the old system of letting the licenses to private individuals by auction still prevails, the number of cases of drunkenness is 10 per cent. of the population, or more than double that of the worst English or Scotch town, and nearly three times the rate in Gothenburg.

Whatever, then, may be said against the Gothenburg system, it remains an undisputed fact, that under its provisions, and in the space of ten years, the ordinary level of drunkenness has been reduced by two-fifths, and the number of houses for the sale of spirits by more than one-half. What proposition is there before the English people from which its most sanguine advocates venture to anticipate similar results within the next generation? Surely it is worth while, in the light of this remarkable experience, to consider if it be not practicable to frame a Bill which should at least render it possible to test, on English soil, the principles which have so generally commended themselves to the Swedish people. Such a measure must of course be permissive. Under a Conservative administration everything is permissive except the Income-Tax. But town councils might be empowered, after giving the usual notice, and on payment of a fair compensation, based on the average profits of the last three years, to acquire all or any of the licenses within its jurisdiction; and at the same time the powers possessed by licensing justices and licensing committees might be vested in the councils, with an appeal to the High Court of Justice only, and subject to the provision that no new license should be granted till the proportion had been reduced to, say, one in five hundred of population. Power should also be given to the councils to deal with any or all of the licenses acquired by them under the Act, in any of the following ways, viz.: (a.) To abandon them altogether. (b.) To grant such licenses to the highest bidder, under conditions to be fixed by the council, and for a period not exceeding three years. (c.) To carry on the trade in the present premises, or in other premises rented or purchased for the purpose, under the conduct of managers, with remuneration independent of the amount of, or profits on, the sale of intoxicating drinks. In the two last cases the amount received for the sale of licenses, or as

profit from the traffic, should be carried to a License Fund to be applied as follows:—

1. To pay interest on all loans contracted for purchase of licenses or premises.
2. To create a sinking fund to extinguish loans in twenty years from date.
3. To pay all costs of management and expenses of carrying out the Act.
4. To buy up and extinguish licenses till the maximum proportion of one in five hundred of the population has been reached.
5. The surplus, if any, to be used, first in securing the earlier repayment of the loans contracted until these have been entirely extinguished, and then to be carried to the credit of the Education rate and the Poor rate in fixed proportions.

A measure of this kind, allowing considerable discretion to local authorities, is certain to produce more than one practical experiment which will contribute usefully to the ultimate solution of the national problem. It concedes the demand for "local option," which is rapidly becoming a *sine quâ non* of all who desire licensing reform, and which has been formally adopted by organizations, as widely divergent in their views on other parts of the subject as the Birmingham Liberal Association, and the four thousand clergy who signed the memorial to the bishops, the Manchester Reform Union, the United Kingdom Alliance, and the National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance. It will also minimise the organized hostility of the publicans and the liquor interest, since it frankly recognises the vested rights they have acquired, and will not touch them without compensation. This is no unimportant recommendation to those who have been forced to acknowledge the immense political power possessed by a body which constitutes nearly five per cent. of the electorate, and which can bring to the poll a much larger proportion by simply exerting its influence with that part of the population which is least interested in political questions, and most amenable to the generous disregard of the "score," which at such seasons accompanies the dispensing of liquor.

By the plan proposed the reduction in the number of licences, which is almost universally admitted to be desirable, can be easily effected, and the operation would adjust itself from time to time according to the advance in public opinion, and the proof afforded of the necessity and advantage of the diminution.

It is not at all likely that in the first instance any town would consent to abolish the sale altogether, as the cost would be greater than the ratepayers would be willing to endure; but it is certain that an exhaustive attempt would be made to prevent the abuse of intoxicants by regulating their use. In the majority of places the

opportunity would be used tentatively, and the council would only extend its operations gradually, and in proportion to the success already achieved. But in some large towns, it may be confidently anticipated that the enterprise and experience of the local authority would lead it boldly to assume the whole responsibility, and to undertake the supply of liquor, as the supply of other limited monopolies—of gas and water, for instance—has already been assumed.

A calculation of Mr. Hoyle's, substantially confirmed by Mr. Dudley Baxter, gives the annual average consumption of alcoholic liquors at £3 15s. per head per annum of the population. Deducting from this the estimated consumption of wine, beer, cider, perry, &c., supplied by wholesale dealers, and not consumed in public-houses and beer-shops, and the probable annual sale of these houses may be taken at £2 10s. per head of the population.

The total sale in Birmingham, with a population of 360,000, would, at this rate, amount to £900,000, on which the average profit is estimated on good authority to be 20 per cent. The compensation, at five years' purchase, would therefore be £900,000, and this would be a fair basis of calculation. The present market value of licenses averages £500 for licensed victuallers and £300 for beer-shops, which would give for the whole of the licenses in the town a total of about £650,000.<sup>1</sup>

But, assuming the larger sum of £900,000, and adding £300,000 for premises, fixtures, and stock, the total capital would be £1,200,000, on which the annual payment for interest and sinking fund at 4 per cent. would be £87,750; and adding £20,000 for the cost of management, there would remain a margin of £72,250 to cover a reduction in the consumption. In other words, the corporation would have it in their power to reduce the number of houses at once by 40 per cent., and to submit to a corresponding decrease in the consumption without adding anything to the burdens of the ratepayers.

If this is not enough it will be in the power of the ratepayers to make such sacrifice of their property as they may deem expedient, and no private right or interest will stand in their way. And under no circumstances will the council have any interest in promoting consumption, since the excess of profit will not benefit them till the licences have been reduced to about one-third of their present number, and till all the loans have been repaid, and then only indirectly by a reduction in rates levied for an expenditure over which they have no control.

(1) Professor Leoni Levi, in a paper read to the Statistical Society, 16th January, 1872, states that the average price realised for lease, goodwill, and fixtures of public-houses in Birmingham was, in 1870 and 1871, £500, and for beerhouses £130. This would make the total value only £450,000.

The same results as to the better conduct of the houses, the security from adulteration, the absence of all temptation to excess, which have obtained in Sweden, would naturally follow the adoption of the plan in this country.

The ordinary objection against the employment of town councils as licensing boards, namely, that the general interests of the town would be compromised in the settlement of this burning question, does not apply when the decision is almost a matter of indifference to the publicans, who are in any case fairly protected from pecuniary loss. A much more serious objection, though a sentimental one, is that if the trade is carried on by the council, all the ratepayers become parties to a traffic which many of them consider an unclean thing, and regard with fierce indignation; but in reply it may be pointed out that the responsibility and participation already exist, since the State limits and regulates the business, and draws an immense revenue from its prosecution. The question, therefore, is not between the assumption of a new responsibility and washing our hands of the whole matter: it is reduced to the issue whether the control already assumed shall be made efficacious and complete. Is it too much to ask from even the most fanatical advocates of prohibition that they shall at any rate stand aside while an experiment is being made which, if successful, will at least save two drunkards out of every five, and, if a failure, will yet be the most powerful instrument for securing still more radical changes? The acceptance of the plan may also be commended to the longer heads in the trade itself, since it is the only one which fairly recognises their vested interests; and if it be rejected it is inevitable that further harassing restrictions will from time to time be imposed upon them, and not at all impossible that licenses may be thrown open without limitation, thus destroying at a blow the value which attaches to the monopoly they now enjoy.

The great majority of the nation, which consists neither of publicans nor teetotallers, and which feels that the social and physiological arguments against the moderate use of stimulants are not altogether conclusive, although the consequences of their abuse are disastrous in the highest degree, would hail with satisfaction any honest attempt to stay the plague of drunkenness, and to remove the temptation to excess which would not unduly interfere with individual liberty, nor deprive the working classes of the comfortable accommodation and the opportunities of social intercourse which they cannot obtain in their own homes in crowded cities. Parliament would be relieved from the interminable discussions on the question which now occupy no inconsiderable portion of the public time, and the problem would be remitted for local solution with fair promise of complete success.

J. CHAMBERLAIN.

## THE CHINESE EMPIRE AND ITS FOREIGN RELATIONS.

THE "Correspondence respecting the Attack of the Indian Expedition to Western China, and the Murder of Mr. Margary," recently presented to both Houses of Parliament, gives us all the information to be obtained at present. More may be known later, and new facts may be brought to light by the Commission despatched from Peking to inquire into all the circumstances connected with the hostile action of the Chinese on the spot. Their mission is to ascertain who were the responsible parties concerned in the murder and the subsequent attack; to trace home both these acts to their instigators and perpetrators. In the meantime there is enough revealed in this blue book as to the objects of the expedition, the nature of the obstacles it encountered, and the subsequent negotiations with the Chinese Government, to supply us with an example both of Chinese policy and Western diplomacy in their latest development. The history of the relations of China with Foreign Powers, in the last thirty years, furnishes indeed many such chapters, quite as full of instruction perhaps, and conveying lessons of similar import; but the most recent experience is the most interesting, if not the best in all other respects in matters of international concern; and there is much within the compass of this last blue book on China, showing how nearly the questions treated touch our interests, and bear upon the whole subject of European diplomacy and Chinese policy. Nor can our interests be so entirely disassociated from those of other Treaty Powers as to admit of their being treated in a separate and isolated manner. Neither China nor Great Britain can claim entire independence of action. The relations of Western Powers with each other and with China render this impossible, if it were desirable, in the exclusive interest of one irrespective of the others. And, although the constant tendency is for each Power, at Peking as elsewhere in the East, to pursue a policy of its own, and not seldom with conflicting aims and interests, yet the general consciousness of a certain *solidarité*, as opposed to Chinese aims and tendencies, has always hitherto operated so far as to unite them, ostensibly at least, in what has been called a co-operative policy, in which such a community of interests was recognised as the basis. With the evidence before us of the consistent tenacity of the Chinese in following out a well-marked line of policy as regards European Powers, and the inadequacy of diplomacy in its usual forms to make any effective way in an opposite direction, no more fitting time could perhaps be chosen for an inquiry into the leading principles and determining motives of a policy the characteristics of which are

obstructiveness and hostility. I believe they all have reference to a single aim—isolation: freedom from all entangling alliances with Western Powers; independence in all that concerns their own territories and dependencies, extending westward to Central Asia, and southward to Burmah and Nepaul; and, above all, exemption from any kind of interference by foreigners, under whatever pretext, in their internal affairs. Such independence and entire isolation was a reality in their past history, when they held sway over the larger portion of Asia. After the discovery of the passage round the Cape, in the fifteenth century, it was still a reality in a practical sense. It is only since the beginning of the present century, when steam and the telegraphic wire have brought all Europe and a new world in the West to their doors, that it is no longer a possibility; but this truth, so patent to the rest of the world, is only imperfectly apprehended to this day by the Chinese mind. There are “grand secretaries” and “members of the Great Council” at Peking, and many more officials, high and low, in the remoter regions of that vast empire, who know indeed that foreigners have invaded their coasts, and swarm in steamships to their maritime provinces, like locusts or pirates, with whose rulers China has to her degradation been constrained, under adverse circumstances, to enter into treaties; but, like men persuaded against their will in other countries, they “retain the same opinion still,” as to the impolicy of publicly recognizing, and the absence of any necessity for the perpetuation of such engagements. They believe there is still power inherent in the sons of Han and the “black-haired race” to assert the independence, if not the old supremacy, of the Emperor, and drive all these foreign intruders into the howling wilderness, or that waste of waters from whence they came.

There may be many to whom this will seem incredible, and who will hesitate to attribute to a nation so far advanced in knowledge and civilisation as the Chinese, the prevalence of ideas so wild and unpractical. At best they can only suppose they are shared by a few of the less sane and the uneducated. Nothing would be easier than to show by the authentic utterances of more than one or two of these high officers within the last ten years, that such opinions do actually and generally prevail. I will only cite one instance here. Wo-jen, a grand secretary of the imperial library, and “senior preceptor” of the youthful emperor, in a state paper of remonstrance criticising and condemning a proposal of the Tsungli Yamên, or Foreign Office of China, to found a college and schools for foreign studies, relieves his mind by declaring that he, in reference to the barbarians, meaning foreigners, “is continually wishing to eat their flesh and sleep on their skin,<sup>1</sup> and thus to satisfy his long-founded

(1) A quotation from the “Spring and Autumn” of Confucius, one of the classics.

hatred." He had already stated that, in his own view, "foreigners are the enemies of China, and though they apparently treat us on amicable terms, yet in their hearts they are anything but friendly, being full of every kind of devilish craft and deceit." As to his opinion of the superior acquirements of foreign nations, he quotes with great gusto an ancient sage (Mencius), who remarked that "China instructs barbarians, but I have not heard of instruction coming from barbarians." True enough, when Mencius spoke, 400 B.C.; and all their knowledge of nations or tribes beyond their boundaries applied to uncivilised tribes of Mongols and Tartars—he does not see how utterly inapplicable it is to the Western nations to which he refers. He ends, on the contrary, by declaring that the idea of China adopting foreign teachers is certainly to him a "very astounding project." Of course it may be said that these are merely the ravings of a crazy old man, blinded by his hatred of innovation. Or, at most, of the anti-foreign party steeped in prejudice, which only represents a small minority of retrograde tendencies, such as exist in all countries. As we have our Tories, the French their Legitimists, and the Russians their Muscovites, opposed in many things to the general intelligence and wishes of the nation; so the Chinese have their national and retrograde party. When he expresses, therefore, the greatest indignation at the phrase "amicable relations" used by the Tsungli Yamèn as implying a forgetfulness "of the long arrear of hatred and vengeance yet unliquidated;" it might be amusing if merely the outbreak rage of an official in his dotage, railing at the degeneracy of the times. But if such feelings are shared by the common people, or by the bulk of the educated and official classes more exclusively, I think it must be generally admitted that such official utterances have a serious significance. I believe this to be the truth. I believe it will be easy to show, by glancing at the past history of the nation, its geographical conditions, and the prevailing influences under which they have lived without change for many centuries—influences stereotyped, so to speak, in their literature, religion, and philosophy—how natural it is in them to think and act in this way. But as demonstration from facts is always more convincing than deductions from general premises: the first step in an inquiry into the real foundations of Chinese policy and its aim, will be a short analysis of the official correspondence filling a hundred and eight pages of this blue book, showing as it does the progress of negotiations with the Chinese Government, protracted over eight months, and their result. In it will be found reiterated utterances of the Prince of Kung, the highest possible authority as to their foreign policy. We may thus have the opportunity of comparing the policy they profess, with the action taken, and draw our own

conclusions as to the degree of credibility attaching to the professions of amity and good faith.

The correspondence begins with a despatch dated March 4th, 1875, from the Earl of Derby to Mr. Wade, informing him that "intelligence had reached the Indian Government from Mandalay, that the mission under Colonel Browne has been attacked and driven back by an armed force, and that Mr. Margary and his servants have been killed at Manwyne. These acts are understood to have been committed by the orders of the Chinese governor of Momein." The substance of this despatch was telegraphed to the Minister at Peking. But before either could reach him he wrote, under date March 12th, to Lord Derby, stating that he had received on the previous day a telegram from the Viceroy of India, to the effect that "the expedition from Bhamo had been attacked at a place called Manwyne, which is some way within the Chinese frontier, and that Mr. Margary had either been killed in the fight or subsequently murdered, I do not quite make out which."

On the same day, March 12th, the correspondence with the Prince of Kung began by our Minister sending "such a statement of the facts" as he conceived the telegram strictly to warrant. The first reply of the Prince simply acknowledges receipt with implied regret, and states that the Yamén of Foreign Affairs communicates at once by express to the Governor General and Governor of Yunnan, desiring them without delay to order an inquiry to be instituted and to make report of the result. This was dated the 14th of March, to which Mr. Wade replied the next day that, "with all there is on record of like offences insufficiently atoned for, the mere intimation of an intention to write express to a provincial government from which no answer can be received for about six months, is not very likely to satisfy Her Majesty's Government." The Prince answers on the 17th, that he had received the news "with the utmost perturbation, so shortly after the receipt of a congratulatory note reporting Mr. Margary's safe arrival in Burmah." But, as regards the implied reproach of insufficient action and delay, the Prince points out, "what is essential, at the same time in cases of this kind, is, that inquiry be instituted for the purpose of discovering the actual murderers as well as of ascertaining from the officials within whose jurisdiction the act has been committed, which having been done, rigorous punishment can be inflicted, as a warning for the future." He then refers to the speed of two hundred miles per diem by which his express has been forwarded and the orders conveyed "to devise with all promptitude the measures which it is requisite should be taken." Having disposed of this part of the question the Prince, by a very characteristic stroke of Chinese diplomacy, insinuates a damaging parallel,



and says he will "never be found to deal negligently with so serious a matter as a case of murder;" adding, "and indeed, with reference to another affair the Tsungli Yamên have already heretofore remarked in a despatch addressed to the British Minister that, "if in cases of homicide the manslayer be set free on a verdict of not guilty, it cannot be possible to satisfy the public mind."

This implied parallel between the two cases, as the British Minister loses no time in pointing out, does not hold good, as no parity whatever, but the widest possible difference existed. It is a good specimen of the kind of adroitness in which the Chinese rejoice. The case referred to was one in which a British subject, an employé of the Chinese Government, finding his workmen violently interfered with in their work for the Chinese Government, a collision ensued in which a shot from the foreigner's pistol, while he was striking one of the Chinese with the butt of his weapon, occasioned the death of another.

This preliminary passage of arms over certain demands for redress were formulated by the British Minister. These appear to have been six by the memorandum published as forwarded to the Tsungli Yamên of March 19th, but in Mr. Wade's telegram to the Earl of Derby three only are referred to—1st. For passports for the officers our Minister might desire to send to Yunnan to be present at whatever proceedings should be had in this case. 2nd. For passports that would enable a second mission from India, should the Viceroy see fit to send one, to cross the common frontier of China and Buirmah. 3rd. For an indemnity of 150,000 taels.

By a telegram from the Earl of Derby the first two demands were approved, and in regard to the third Mr. Wade was informed that, while confiding in his discretion, Her Majesty's Government would await further explanation of his demand for any indemnity; to which Mr. Wade, in his despatch dated the 14th of April, from Shanghai, replied that, while he had made the delivery of the passports a *sine qua non*, he had not made a *sine qua non* of the indemnity, and only "recommended" it. He further adds that the Prince had offered as a favour, that portion of the whole sum originally named which he had told his Imperial Highness was allotted to the family of Mr. Margary; but that he had declined this offer, and had intimated his intention to abstain from all further reference to indemnity until he should receive instructions on the subject.

The demands actually made included besides these, certain steps to be taken to give better effect to Article IV. of the Treaty of 1858, concerning the privileges and position of diplomatic agents; to the articles of the treaty respecting trade, and freedom from imposts ~~over and above~~ the tariff duties, and the settlement of all claims arising out of the action of the officials.

In answer to these demands, the Prince and his colleagues of the Yamên did not fail to try the strength of the adversary's armour. They contest the right of the British Government to nominate officials to be present at the trial of a Chinese—to appoint anything like a mission, or permanent officials, elsewhere than at the ports, for the protection of trade or traders. The "Chinese Government" it is emphatically stated, "has never, by the terms of any enactment given sanction to trade carried on within the limits of a subject state." The Russian appointment of officials as residents at Urga and at Kuldja, on the Mongolian border and in Turkestan, might have been cited as seriously contravening the principle here so confidently asserted. But it is very significant when advanced in view of the known object of the British to extend a trade already established in the tributary State of Burmah, across the border into Yunnan and the South-Western Provinces. The first resident Russian Consul at Urga was appointed under the provisions of a supplementary treaty signed at Pekin Nov. <sup>2</sup>/<sub>14</sub> of 1860—that is, a few days after the English and French forces arrived, and the capitulation of the capital which followed, when the ratifications of the treaty of 1858 with Great Britain and France were exchanged. The negotiation had no doubt been pressed forward by the Russians when the Chinese Emperor was already preparing to fly from his capital to escape capture, and the Government was in no condition to resist another enemy, or provoke any hostile action on their Mongolian frontier. The distinction contended for by the Chinese between the Treaties entered into with Russia on the inland frontiers, and those with other Foreign Powers, can hardly be maintained, especially as against Great Britain, for it also is an Asiatic power with a conterminous frontier, marching with Nepaul, Tibet, and Burmah, all tributary States or dependencies of China. If it be contended that this contact is not with China itself, but only its dependencies, the same argument equally applies in the case of Russia; for neither is Manchuria or Mongolia a component part of China Proper. But more than this, as Mr. Markham shows in his valuable work on Mr. Bogle's mission to Tibet recently published, when referring to this subject, Mr. Shishmaroff, who was the first consul at Urga in 1868, "made a rapid journey of thirteen days from Urga to Uliasutai, to conclude a trade convention with the Chinese Amba.' We may well ask, therefore, on what ground of international right can China deny the British all access to Nepaul or Tibet, conterminous as both these countries are for the greater part of their length with our Indian Empire, and enter into a trade convention with the Russians for their admission? Some years ago (in 1868-9) the French put forward a claim accordingly to establish a Consul at Urga, under the most favoured

nation clause, as a treaty right, founded on the concession to Russia. The time seems to have arrived when we should do the same, with an extension of the principle as to other places.

In regard to the other demands made, various pleas were set up with more or less plausibility—as to diplomatic intercourse with the higher officials and heads of departments, the redress of the *lekin* grievances, the whole system of levying transit dues on British trade inland, and finally, the payment of an indemnity. To the first it was objected that the forms of etiquette were different in the two countries, and they were debarred at present from altering them (alluding to the minority apparently); as to the transit dues, that they had nothing to do with the present affairs; and with reference to an indemnity, it was the law of China, which by treaty should be applied, and any award must be based upon the value of effects which may have been lost.

There is no doubt that the Chinese could find much to support them in their resistance to all the demands, except perhaps that for the punishment of the offenders concerned in the murder of Mr. Margary and the attack on Colonel Browne's party. On the ground of an act of war having been committed, with or without the sanction or authority of the Chinese Government, it is quite clear they could rightly be held responsible for the acts of their officers, and liable, therefore, to make such amends as might seem just, whether money, territory, or trade privileges. It might be open to question how far it was expedient or otherwise, to include diplomatic privileges, and long litigated grievances about transit dues, and irregular levy of inland duties generally, among the conditions of a satisfactory settlement. But it cannot be contested as a principle of universal acceptance in the law of nations, that "when the officials of a government are shown to have acted not once, but, during a term of years, repeatedly, with treachery and ferocity towards the subjects of other governments, it must rest with the latter, if their strength admit, to exact in a particular instance of the peccant government, such retribution as may at once atone for the past and make the future secure." Now the offence for which satisfaction had to be claimed, as from one government to another, by the British Minister, is of the gravest character, and within the first month was placed before the Chinese Foreign Yamèn in the following unmistakable terms:—

"A small party of British officers and others entering Yunnan from Burmah, with the full knowledge of the Chinese Government, central and provincial, and under passports furnished by the Tsungli Yamèn, has been attacked in the subprefecture of Momien by a body of Chinese troops, sent against them, according to the Chief Commissioner of the Indian Government at Mandalay, by the

authorities of Monien, and one of their number brutally murdered." With such a charge brought home, there is nothing which the British Minister has yet asked which exceeds, or in any degree approaches, the limit of what his government may rightly demand in satisfaction. The particular concessions or compensations that may most fitly or wisely be required, is within those limits a question of expediency and policy, rather than of right or justice; since of right, much more might be exacted than the Chinese have as yet had any reason to apprehend. How such demands as have been made, were debated and evaded; with what wearisome and persistent iteration the same arguments were again and again brought forward as if for the first time, and what endless delays were interposed on minor points, even when the principle seemed conceded, is set forth at length in the further ninety pages of official correspondence. These must be read for those who have never had to deal with Chinese officials to understand their perversity and their perseverance in resistance, even after they see the hopelessness of averting concession or defeat. They were told before the end of the first month of this correspondence, that "every day's delay" was of the most serious consequence, and that the presence of a British officer at the investigation had from the first been declared to be the condition beyond all others important; and yet it was not until October 10 that Mr. Wade was enabled to announce to Lord Derby that the tenor of the Prince's answers would allow Mr. Grosvenor to start on his mission to Yunnan. Nor was this result secured after all the six months of discussion and negotiation, until Mr. Wade had fixed the day of his departure from Peking, and with it the interruption of diplomatic relations.

What may be the final issue, and how far that will correspond with any hopes our Minister on the spot may have formed, or the efforts these verbal concessions have cost him, it would be hazardous to offer any very definite opinion at this distance. But so far as past experience may be taken for guidance, I should not be very sanguine. It may be possible for Mr. Grosvenor and his two able interpreters, Messrs. Davenport and Baber, to satisfy themselves so far as to prevent any really innocent men being sacrificed, in lieu of the real perpetrators of Mr. Margary's murder and that of his servants. This will be something gained. Whether the true criminals will be produced and identified by satisfactory witnesses or evidence must, I think, be doubtful. Truth is not usually extracted either from accused or witnesses among Chinese without torture, and the adoption of this mode of taking evidence would be precluded by the presence of British officials. Yet by Chinese law capital punishment cannot be inflicted, except upon the confession of the accused, or such overwhelming evidence of guilt as could hardly be obtained in

any case unless the criminal were taken red-handed in the commission of a crime. In all probability these formed part of a mob of disorderly trained bands and roughs of the dangerous classes, covertly instigated by those in authority to make a clean sweep of the Englishman and his Chinese followers. It will be still more difficult to bring home to those in authority, who were most likely the authors of the mischief, and the most guilty, their participation in the crime. I do not think we are justified, as at present advised, in believing these acted under any positive instructions to slay the members of the mission, on either side of the border. I think it much more probable that they erred by excess of zeal, thinking to deserve well of those higher placed, whose wishes for the failure of the expedition they either know or anticipated, in preventing Margary's return and Colonel Browne's advance across the Chinese frontiers. If such should be the true history of the affair, it is scarcely to be expected that even Chinese authorities will voluntarily sacrifice their over-zealous agents. Of course if Li-ssa-ta-ye or his nephew can be satisfactorily proved to have either led the troops or sanctioned the attack on Colonel Browne's party, there ought to be no difficulty in securing their degradation and banishment. But the Chinese empire is so vast, and Chinese subterfuges so ingenious and constant, that I should not myself feel much faith as to the reality of any sentence on such offenders, or its permanent effects, which stopped short of execution in the presence of trustworthy witnesses.

So much for justice. As regards other demands for satisfaction and atonement, we may, I hope, be more sure of substantial redress. The indemnity in money to any amount claimed will of course be paid. But unless it be raised in the shape of a fine, actually levied on the town or district in which the crime was perpetrated, and thus act as a deterrent in future against like acts, by giving the inhabitants of every town a direct interest in preventing mob violence and massacres, the gain may be a loss in other respects. If paid by the Government, and out of the Chinese Treasury, it will look too much like blood-money, and a price voluntarily accepted for British lives, which it should be our policy to show no money could compensate for in our estimation. The improvement of our status and diplomatic position in Peking, the establishment of a trade across the Burmah-Chinese borders, in Yunnan, under well-considered regulations, and the removal of taxing grievances in the interior by reason of duties levied irregularly or in excess, would form the best and most substantial compensation we could demand, and if these can be secured much would be gained.

But I would go further, since I think Her Majesty's Government might justly insist at the same time on the removal of all restrictions

barring access to the tributary states of Nepaul and Tibet from our Indian territories. In the interest of British trade these would be the conditions I should be glad to see enforced, as the fitting atonement for an act of war, and a deed of singular atrocity. The most difficult of attainment will, probably, be any effective exemption from the *lekin* and other surtaxes on foreign trade in the interior, because these arise not so much from wrongs perpetrated by the will of the central government, as from abuses inherent in their provincial administration. In the matter of fiscal administration, nothing can well be worse, or less under control even of the high provincial authorities. Where taxes are farmed out, and no barrier or custom-house establishments are adequately paid, extortion and bribery, with all the parasite evils attending, are the necessary concomitants. These conditions cannot be altered by any law or edict from Pekin. To stop such abuses and irregularities, there must be a radical reform of the whole fiscal administration of the empire, and this must begin by apportioning proper salaries to all the *employés*, from the Viceroy to the inferior officials and police runners. Where is this to begin, and where is the money to come from? It would require about the same kind of revolution in fiscal affairs and budgets, as we may hardly imagine if in this small group of islands, smaller than any one of the eighteen provinces of China, and with fewer inhabitants, it was suddenly determined by act of parliament that all the unpaid services rendered by municipalities, vestries, poor-law guardians, and justices of the peace, should be adequately paid according to the market value of time and labour and qualifications. What would be simply impracticable here, would be a thousand times more impossible in the Chinese Empire, looked at in a merely financial point of view. In this generation, at least, it would be still impossible, apart from financial difficulties, from the want of a class of officials with any honest repugnance to bribes or corruption, and a similar want of public opinion to attach reprobation to such practices. In the absence of any adequate payment for services to the State, the exacting of illegal fees and bribes has come to be considered as a necessary condition of public employment. It was so once in England, and is so still at this day in many countries of the Western world. How the British Minister proposes, therefore, to effect his reforms in the collection of inland taxes, as they affect British trade, I am unable to say. It appeared to me, after a long and earnest study of the question in all its bearings some years ago, that the only hope lay in an arrangement by which all inland duties of any kind should be prohibited on foreign goods—the great bulk of which are readily recognisable without the necessity of any certificate of origin—the Chinese revenue being of course compensated to the amount of the

transit dues fixed by treaty, by these being collected on entry at the maritime customs. On this basis clauses were introduced into the Convention of 1869, but the merchants, I am afraid, allowed their distrust of the Chinese to override all other considerations, and refused their assent to it even as an experiment. There was, however, another difficulty to which my successor, warned possibly by this past experience, alludes in one of his despatches to the Earl of Derby, and subsequently to the consul at Shanghai, where he reminds the mercantile community of what, he says, he found there was "a constant tendency to forget," namely, "that with a trade regulated by provisions common to all the treaties, it is not competent for the British Minister, any more than for the Minister of any other Treaty Power, single-handed to negotiate any conditions that will modify the existent treaty provisions; or, more exactly, to negotiate conditions that will be operative." And he concludes, with perfect truth, that "unless it had formally accepted the changes agreed to, any one Power, no matter how insufficient its share of the China trade, would in most instances be able to neutralise the effect of any new provision, though assented to, it might be, by all the Powers most interested in trade." It is true, also, beyond dispute or question, as he observes to the Consul, that "foreign trade in China is a common property, changes in the regulation of which, to be effective, must have been accepted by all alike." Whether any improvement, under the circumstances, may be found possible, remains to be seen, but what he has striven to obtain in this direction, is plainly stated to be "a formal engagement on the part of the Chinese Government that inquiry should be made into the question of taxation of foreign trade, whether at the consular ports or beyond their limits, and that a Report should be prepared on which, were it found otherwise impossible to rectify practices at present objected to, modification of existent conditions might be negotiated."

In closing this last blue book on China, it is impossible, after a careful perusal of the whole of the correspondence, not to be impressed with the evidence borne on every page almost, that the Chinese Government have abated nothing of their traditional averseness to any movement by which they may be committed to greater freedom of intercourse, or more open declaration of treaty obligations. Hence the frequent violation of these by provincial authorities and the people; and among other evils, as our Minister wrote to the Prince, the attitude forced upon a Foreign Power when a difference arises, of one which feels, that, without intimidation or a resort to force, it has but a faint chance of obtaining any redress. Its exclusiveness, as strong as ever, and its refusal to draw near to the rest of the world, is undoubtedly a constant source of danger. We

can only hope this truth was at last dawning on the Prince of Kung towards the close of the correspondence, when, in a memorial of the Tsungli Yamên to the throne, proposing intercourse between the heads of departments and other high officers, with foreign Ministers and diplomatic missions to foreign states, they observe that "their minds must have free access to each other before angry collisions between them can be prevented." If we can hope, with Sir Thomas Wade, that these negotiations may mark the commencement of a "new era in foreign relations with China," the lives that have been lost will not have been sacrificed wholly in vain, and the efforts it has cost to obtain even initiatory steps and a promise of redress will have been well bestowed. But at the same time, it is only too evident that the present state of our relations with China is eminently unsatisfactory. Western diplomacy is at a sore disadvantage in coping with the fixity of purpose and immobility of Chinese policy. The ability and energy displayed in the one is of little avail in an encounter with the passive resistance of the other. To overcome this more is needed, and that more resolves itself into active force and war. Thrice in less than thirty years we have been driven to this extremity, and no year passes without this danger being incurred by reason of illegalities and acts of violence for which the Chinese Government must be held responsible. In no case has full and prompt redress ever been obtained, or any show of such redress without prolonged contention and evasive measures, such as the present blue book gives only too fair an example of in both directions. In no case has any practical result been attained, without intimidation, if not a commencement of execution, by the aid of our naval forces.

It is no question here of the amount of ability shown by our present Minister at Peking in the conduct of these harassing and still unterminated negotiations. As I have already said in a former article, Sir Thomas Wade has brought to his task exceptional advantages, some of which are peculiarly his own. Not only a long experience in the country has given him great knowledge of Chinese nature and the character of the people he has had to deal with, but the still more rare acquaintance with their literature and classics in the original, in addition to a command of their language in speaking. The approval of Her Majesty's Government, and the honours bestowed in token of it, sufficiently attest the value of his services and fitness for the high post he fills. And yet the practical conclusion remains, that all these efforts of diplomacy are unequal to the task of placing our relations with China on any satisfactory footing of permanence and reciprocity. For diplomacy pure and simple, there is in truth no field at Peking. No power of reasoning, or force of argument, ever yet stirred by a hair's breadth the fixed resolve of Chinese officials,



when foreign interests were involved, to exhaust every means of obstruction and resistance their position would allow before they yielded. It is beating the air to talk to them of treaty rights and obligations, the claims of justice, or the benefits that would accrue to them, as to us, by a more progressive and liberal policy. The tiro in such work is at first charmed with the courtesy and patience shown in listening to what he hopes may prove convincing arguments. They are even met, in reply, with a certain show of appreciative intelligence and willingness to be convinced or better informed. When, however, many such interviews, and interminable correspondence in further elucidation, have exhausted the subject, and the time has arrived for action or some definite result, the disillusion quickly follows. Perhaps at a final meeting for the purpose of settlement, and there is nothing more apparently to be said on either side, his proposal to settle the terms of agreement is met by a request in the blandest accents, and with perfectly unmoved countenance, to explain what it is that is wanted, as he is ready to hear! All that has passed in weeks of discussion and correspondence is as though it had never been. It is simply ignored, and the whole argument, on which days or weeks have been consumed, has to be begun *de novo*—or abandoned as hopeless. What can diplomacy avail against such adversaries? A foreign representative may weary of this system of passive resistance and inertia, but the Chinese official comes up smiling day after day, and never tires or gives in, unless he sees behind the last word something more tangible than words, and less easily resisted than arguments. Until that hour arrives, it is only another version of the fable of the wolf learning to read, who could make nothing out of the letters, however they were put before him, but "lamb." To the Chinese official, nothing which foreign lips can say ever leaves any other impression upon him than "China," with its traditional hatred of all that is either new or foreign.

Discouraging as this may seem, and embarrassing as it certainly is, there is nothing very surprising in their fixity of ideas and purpose, and it is not without a parallel in other countries. In nearly all, and certainly in all old countries with a history and traditions, there is a party which resists on principle and conscientiously, innovation and progress of every kind. Both are hateful to them, by habits, tastes, and associations. The words sound like a tocsin in their ears, ominous of evil, if not of ruin and anarchy, with all their accompaniments of spoliation, disorder and violence. We have been lately reminded that in our own land there is a party of resistance, which even after such grave lessons as the Catholic Emancipation, the Reform Act, and the Repeal of the Corn laws, with a host of other liberal measures, continue opposed on principle to every change

or considerable innovation. The Anti-Foreign Party in China is only an exaggerated form of the same phenomenon, only they are in a majority instead of being, as with us, a comparatively small minority of the nation. They have the country with them, and not only the mass of the people, and the popular voice, but all the literati, that is, the educated classes. What can diplomacy do against such a compact and determined opposition at the furthest extremity of Asia, nearly one-third of which is under their rule, and peopled by some 300,000,000 of subjects welded together into one nation by identity of origin and language, still more by traditions, customs, and religion?

I have in a former article, traced or rather glanced at, some of the most distinctive features in the physical geography of the wide region under Chinese rule, and the past history of the race, from an early period, as abiding and permanent influences. I may now therefore, though still more briefly and rapidly, ask attention to the main inferences to be drawn from both combined.

China within the Great Wall represents the central nucleus of unification and civilisation to which all the Tartar and Mongol tribes in successive descents from the hyperborean regions of Siberia and the Mongol steppes and deserts east and west have gravitated as by a natural law, there to be transformed from nomads into citizens, and from pastoral tribes into agriculturists and traders, exchanging their tents for walled towns, and becoming members of a law-governed State. The absorbent and assimilating power of the Chinese, ever since the fusing process of amalgamation began and led to the unification of tribal sections, is one of the most remarkable features of their history. Dynasties have changed, Chinese, Mongol and Tartar have succeeded each other, sometimes in quiet succession, but the process of conversion into Chinese has been continuous and certain. They had at last evidently nothing to fear from the invasion of the hardy and fierce nomads, everywhere pressing on their borders, beyond the momentary waste and disturbance of established rule.

Another and not less remarkable feature is to be noted in this connection. The Chinese as a race, or a nation, by their superior civilisation and great numbers, have always asserted and maintained that kind of dominion and authority which the higher and more perfect organizations throughout nature, and in animal life more especially, never fail to exercise, consciously or otherwise. Thus it has followed, again as by a natural law, that over the nomads and less civilised hordes occupying the vast regions beyond their borders, as far as the Himalayas and Central Asia, they have exercised a controlling power, and more or less absolute dominion. By force, when needed, they have unfailingly asserted their supremacy. Ruth-

less and unsparing in its application as Tartar or Mongol ever devised, the Eleuths and Tourgouths, the former once the most powerful tribes in Central Asia, were all but exterminated, and the remnants driven utterly away. It is true that after having entirely subjected or driven away those who make any resistance, they are willing to offer acceptable terms to all who remain, and even to wile some of their former enemies back to their native steppes, as in the memorable case of the banished tribe of Tourgouths, invited by the Emperor Kienlung in 1772 to return from Russian sway to their ancient possessions. In this their policy is not unlike that of the Romans, "*Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos.*" The punishments they inflict are barbarous and horrible. They not only exterminate whole tribes, but break victims of their vengeance on the wheel, quarter or tear them asunder by wild horses, boil their feet, and perpetrate every kind of torture. But to the peaceably disposed they adopt a wise policy of conciliation to induce them to settle, by placing military colonies—troops in large numbers with their families—at all important points, and providing slave labour by sending criminals to till the soil in servitude. The Mongols thus find a demand for their cattle and other produce, and are gradually induced to become stationary, to meet it and reap the profits. Thus partly by force, but also by bribes and example, they bring all tribes under their rule. So in Songaria we find mixed together Eleuths with a tribe of Tourgouths, and remnants of the Songares, together with Mongols, Manchus and Chinese troops—settlers and convicts all mingled together, and in peaceful relations. In proof of the success of this profound and astute policy, it is only necessary to observe the comparative security of traffic and caravans on the line of road across the desert from the pass of Kiayu to Hami and Urumtsi; for ages the line of internal communication between the West of China and the regions lying around and in the basins of the Yarkand river and the Caspian, in contrast to the hazards, and robberies, and poverty met on the great roads in Bokhara, and the regions south and west of the Belur-Tag. This was equally remarkable in the days of the Mongol dynasty, under Kublai Khan, as it is now under a more feeble rule, and after a long series of insurrections and disastrous foreign wars. One other characteristic must not be overlooked. By policy and the adroit adoption of a prevailing religious element, they have always been able to employ in their conquests beyond the Wall, as tributaries or subjects, all the Tartar and Mongol tribes. Thus aided, they have ruled supreme over Mongolia, Ili, all the vast region lying on each side of the Celestial Mountains, including a tract nearly as large as Mongolia, of which, until recently, Eastern Turkestan formed the southern circuit between the Gobi and Caspian deserts, and reaching

as far as the Hindu Kush, leading down to the valley of the Indus. All this belonged to Ili, and was governed from Peking, and may be so again in a very short time, if no foreign intervention arrest the progress of the Chinese arms.

The large town of Kashgar, situated at the north-western angle of the southern division on the Yarkand river, is the centre of several converging roads, including the great caravan route from China through Kucha, which terminates there; and the trade concentrated here makes it the emporium of the commerce of Central Asia, where Russians, Tibetans, Afghans, Sikhs, and representatives from all parts of the Chinese empire and the valley of the Caspian are to be found. Some of this trade and activity since the rebellion of 1865 has been transferred to Yarkand, which has since become the capital, and is now occupied as the seat of government of Yacoub Beg, or the Atalih-Gazi, as the ruler *de facto* is now more usually styled. From these facts, what is the most obvious and important inference? Is it not that the Chinese, as a nation, have for a long succession of ages shown themselves not only greatly superior to all surrounding nationalities, however grouped, but to possess an absolute superiority in the art of governing. They first succeeded in blending under one form of government all the raw and discordant elements, given to division and internecine wars within the eighteen provinces, and have ever since maintained a dominating power and influence. Over thousands of square miles, and vast regions of desert, steppe and mountain, to the very centre of Asia, and far into the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, and even south of the Himalayas, in Nepaul, Bhutan and Tibet, as against Eastern States, they are and always have been irresistible; and, by the extent of their dominions, the numbers and industry of their population, and the traditions and framework of their government, they must be regarded as supreme in Eastern Asia—the one great power which counterbalances Russia, and marches with it into the central lines of communication on the borders of Bokhara and Khiva. Russia, at Urga and Kuldja, is in close contact on two of the great trade routes leading from the west into China. Yarkand would give that Power the gates which lead direct into the western provinces and the southern line of trade, also which passes through Tibet to Lhasa and Batang and the borders of Szechuen, the richest of all the eighteen provinces. That China should desire to regain this key to their middle kingdom, and the best locked of their tributary states, Tibet, while Russia might find her advantage in preventing it, is too self-evident to escape notice. Quite recently, a telegram from the Russian correspondent of the *Times* informed us that—

“A commercial caravan accompanied by a Cossack escort and a scientific expedition, is about to leave the Russo-Siberian Province of Semipalatinsk to

proceed to Western China by the new route from Sainan to Lan Tchu, on the Yellow River, explored by Colonel Sosnovski. The new route is 2,000 versts shorter than the Kiachta road, and perfectly practicable for vehicles."

And still more recent telegrams speak of the Russian Government having assigned a considerable sum for the survey of the Orenburg Tashkend Railway, which is to begin at once.

The Semipalatinsk route is to strike, in a direct line from it, the great caravan route already described, midway at Hami, across the desert of Gobi at its narrowest part, and enter China through the western portal or the Kiayu Pass. If they have the permission of the Chinese Government to avail themselves of this road through the western pass, instead of stopping short at Kiachta and Urga, as heretofore, then the whole of the relations of Russia and China are undergoing a momentous change in practice and principle; and it is difficult to see on what plea they can oppose our right to pursue the caravan routes which lead into Tibet from Sikhim and Nepaul and Assam, or into Yunnan from Burmah. Apart from the "most favoured nation clause" in all the treaties of Western Powers with China—ours among the rest—which they have hitherto contended had only reference to maritime commerce and the ports on the coast, there can be no plausible ground for denying to us, with territories touching Nepaul and Tibet, what is granted to Russia with its conterminous borders. If force is allowed to prevail in the one case, their weakness cannot be allowed to justify the establishment of an injurious inequality as between two great Western Powers in matters of trade. If a Russian consul may be established at Urga, within the Chinese western border, we may equally claim the right to appoint a consul to reside at Shasu or Batang. It is very natural that Russia should desire an outlet for Western Siberia and its products by the most direct road to China, where unlimited markets and river transit are available. But it is no less natural that we should claim an equal right of transit through Nepaul into Central Asia and its markets, or to Tibet by Sikhim, or the Mishmi valley, for our Assam tea and other Indian products, or from British Burmah to Yunnan across the tributary states, by a treaty of reciprocity and exchange. The time has, in fact, arrived when it is no longer possible for China to maintain its traditional policy of isolation, even within the partial limits of maritime commerce. Both Russia and Great Britain, equally great as eastern and western powers, are now conterminous states with China, and we are not to be denied the same free access for our trade from the land side, as we, in common with Russia, have secured from the sea. The next great turning-point in the relations of China with the Treaty Powers must be this—and it is close at hand, despite the undisguised repugnance of the Government at Peking to yield consent. In a strategic point of view China

may still desire to recover Eastern Turkestan, and hold in possession the great central meeting of caravan routes at Yarkand, between the east and the west,—between the Chinese provinces and Western Asia, by which, in centuries past, before the discovery of the passage round the Cape, nearly all the wealth of India and China which found its way to Europe was carried. It has hitherto been the policy of Russian governments to obtain exclusive possession and a monopoly of these trade routes between the west of China and Central Asia. But it is neither consistent with our interests as a great commercial nation nor as an Eastern power and rulers of India, to submit to this restrictive and monopolising spirit. A policy founded upon a principle of monopoly and exclusion is, under such circumstances, one of hostility; nearly as much as overt acts of war directed against the rights enjoyed in common by the law of nations. And the only condition on which Russia, China, and Great Britain can maintain in contiguous territories relations of amity, is one of reciprocity and equality in all that concerns the interests of trade, the very basis of which is free access for peaceable intercourse and exchange of products. If Russia and China will admit this, there need be, and there should be, no risk of collision or cause of enmity. Any rivalry or conflict of interests as regards the development of trade need not take other form than it does in Europe, where the well-understood advantages of an exchange of products, more than counterbalance any prejudice that may result from competition and the absence of a monopoly.

But all the more recent information from Russia and China, as to the aim and intentions of their respective Governments, gives little hope that either the one or the other will so understand the common interest of all, if left to themselves. The last returns of Russian trade show a steady decrease throughout Central Asia in the consumption of Russian woollens and other manufactured produce; and the telegraphic news of fresh efforts to push on their lines of communication and obtain new outlets and centres of trade in Turkestan and Western China sufficiently indicates a fixed policy. The two latest announcements published by the Russian Telegraphic Agency are beyond all others significant. The first, under date April 6th, tells us that “the Emperor has just authorised a survey of the railway which is to cross Central Asia by Ekaterinburg and Tashkent for a length of 2,000 kilometres. This line will join at Ekaterinburg the Siberian line of Nijni Troumenc, confirmed last December. According to the plans of Colonel Bogdanovitch, the survey greatly increases the importance of the Siberian line.” The object is plainly to open a more direct line of trade and communication between Western Siberia and the Western Provinces of China, linking it into the railroad system proceeding from Novogorod and Semipalatinsk either projected or completed.

But a still more significant and important telegram appeared of the 10th April, which solves all doubt as to the part Russia has determined to take in the approaching struggle between the Atalih Gazi (Yacoob Beg) at Yarkand, in Eastern Turkestan, and the Chinese forces now *en route* for the recovery of the revolted province:—

“The Russian Colonel Sosnovski, during his recent journey in the Mongol Provinces of Western China, engaged in the name of his Government to supply 20,000 pounds of wheat to the Chinese troops stationed in those parts. The corn, which is to be paid for by the Chinese Government, will be sent from Semipalatinsk to Gutschén. As it was the want of food which prevented the Chinese in those parts from operating against Yakoob Beg of Kashgar, the provisions received from Russia will enable them to resume operations in Dsungary.”

It is impossible to overlook the importance of this step. By making common cause with the Chinese, they will in all probability ensure the defeat of Yacoob Beg with his Muhommedan following. And such defeat, not only means the re-conquest and entire subjection of what is popularly known as Eastern Turkestan—with the *de facto* ruler of which we have entered into relations of amity and commerce at no small cost—but the extermination of the Mussulman population and the closing of all the frontier to British trade. These are grave results, the effects of which are likely to extend much beyond the immediate boundaries of Turkestan. Russia thus hopes to secure the uncontested monopoly of the whole trade of Central Asia from Bokhara and Yarkand to Batang, and into the rich provinces of Western China, at comparatively little cost by a stroke of policy. Whereas, had she sided with Yacoob Beg, Turkestan might indeed have been secured, but the gates of China on the Western Provinces and all access to them would have been firmly closed. Russia and China, the one occupying the northern half of Asia, and the other an equally large portion to the South and East nearly, may now join hands together and do what seemeth good to them. Those who dwell in the fertile valleys of Kashgar and Yarkand, can scarcely congratulate themselves like the sons of Korah that “Mercy and Truth are met together, Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other.” It must soon become to them as apparent as to the rest of the world, that over the whole of Asia, North and East of the Himalayas, there is no power to gainsay what both may agree upon. If they can only be in accord, with a common feeling of exclusiveness and hostility to the rest of Europe, a compact may be made. It is possible that Chinese rulers may see in a Russian alliance offensive and defensive, a solid basis for resistance to other powers. They may believe that the danger of such a compact with one so near and powerful will be less, and life more tolerable, than under a hollow truce with many, and a perpetual menace of rupture.

RUTHERFORD ALCOCK.

## CRUELTY TO ANIMALS—A STUDY IN SOCIOLOGY.

SOME philosophers hold that whatever we feel in our conscience to be right, is right. Others assert that the course of action to be approved is evidently that which leads to the greatest balance of pleasure over pain. In casting up this credit and debit account, we may properly include not only the pleasures and pains of all mankind, but those of the lower animals, so far as they can be estimated and compared with human feelings. However these fundamental questions of moral science may be settled, it is curious to reflect how little the two standards of right do as a matter of fact correspond. In a great many instances which might be pointed out, public sentiment condemns and rigorously represses one particular form of hurtful action, while it condones or approves deeds of a parallel nature equally against the greatest-happiness principle. Prevailing moral sentiments seem to be founded on no nice appreciation of comparative evil and comparative good.

It has often struck me that the English people are under some misapprehensions about their national virtues. Long ago they abolished public lotteries, and a lottery wheel is now considered a wicked and demoralising thing, except in its rather ominous connection with the sale of works of art. But though lottery wheels are abolished, they tolerate the existence of a betting system as demoralising as any lotteries which ever were held. It is true that there are laws against betting in public, which save the national conscience in some degree; but every one is aware that the nation deliberately ignores the existence of betting rings among its own aristocratic governors, and does not make earnest efforts to suppress the practice.

The English feel their superior virtue, again, in the matter of slavery. They set the world the example of abolishing this odious thing; the very name of slavery cannot be endured in England. When it became known that certain South Sea Islanders were being kidnapped occasionally, and carried into some sort of slavery in Queensland, the Government took prompt and effectual measures against this abominable practice; but when it was stated that the Australian aborigines in the north of Queensland were being shot like kangaroos, or poisoned wholesale by strychnine, one solitary member of parliament went so far as to ask the Government whether this was true. The Government replied that they did not know, but would make inquiries, and nothing more has been heard of the matter to the present day. Accounts which I have heard of the



proceedings in the border districts of Queensland are simply dreadful. These accounts may or may not be true,<sup>1</sup> and I should not like to vouch for them; but the point is that English society, though it runs wild about surrendering a fugitive slave, has never cared even to ascertain whether or not scores of the Australian natives are shot like kangaroos, or poisoned by strychnine like the native dogs.

The most remarkable, however, of all such cases of disproportionate moral sentiment is found in the case of cruelty to animals. In this respect, again, the English are pre-eminently a virtuous people. Less advanced or, it may be, degenerate nations still indulge in savage sports like bull-fighting. I remember that a kind of thrill of horror went through the newspapers when it was once reported that the Empress Eugenic had attended a bull-fight. Long ago the English abolished such a brutal practice as bull-baiting, which is now only a matter of history. It is pleasing to hear of the intelligence and success with which the police everywhere follow the tracks of cock-fighters. A party of men cannot meet on the most secluded moor in the country, but the force are down upon them before many "mains" have been fought. The praiseworthy efforts of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals are unceasing. A man ties crackers to the tail of a pigeon to make it fly better. He is marched before a magistrate and fined. An ingenious menagerie-keeper makes hyænas jump through a blazing ring. The bench denounce the gross cruelty, it having been given in evidence that hyænas are much afraid of fire; but they ultimately discharge the accused, on the ground that hyænas are not domesticated animals. Within the last few days a man has been fined for taming a horse by electricity. Again, it is thought a very cruel thing to bait rabbits or other animals in an enclosed space, and every now and then a beerhouse-keeper suffers under the Act against this cruel practice; but, curiously enough, if you only let the animals have a run in an open space before they are killed by the dogs, this is not cruel, being called *coursing* as contrasted to *baiting*. That is to say, if you let an animal endure the fear of death for a short time, and exhaust itself in vain efforts to escape, and then give it the actual pains of death, there is no cruelty.

But I need hardly go on at any great length to show that the sentiments of the public in respect of cruelty to animals are simply

(1) Since writing the above I have found that these statements are to a great extent confirmed in a work just published upon Queensland, called "The Queen of the Colonies." A squatter destroyed a whole tribe of blacks by giving them a bag of flour poisoned by strychnine. This crime is comparable with that of Thomassen. No attempt was made to punish him. Another case, in which two blacks were intentionally poisoned by strychnine, is also mentioned. The shooting and poisoning of natives is said to have ceased in the last few years; but ought we to be satisfied by vague and unsupported assertions in a matter of this kind?

in a chaotic state. There is no approximation whatever to the utilitarian standard. An almost infinite amount of needless pain is inflicted upon the lower animals every day, and yet, because it is done in a familiar form, the inspectors of the Society pass it over, and indeed the laws take no cognizance of it. Sportsmen and ratcatchers ruthlessly leave wounded animals to die slowly and in torture. But if men tie crackers to the tails of pigeons, the fact of their conviction is telegraphed to every daily newspaper in the country, and appears under the sensational heading, "A New Phase of Cruelty."

By far the most irrational of moral sensations, however, is that excited by the revelations of vivisection. It is not too much to say that the public have almost unanimously been shocked by the details of experiments which the Society for the Abolition of Vivisection have taken care to make widely known. That a number of medical men should have met at Norwich, and coolly stood by to witness M. Magnan cut open the thighs of two dogs, and inject alcohol and absinthe therein, drove many people almost wild with indignation. When, in 1873, the authors of the "Handbook of the Physiological Laboratory" published their unlucky volume, and disclosed the secrets of the vivisection table, a part of the public seemed to become almost inarticulate with rage, that such things should be allowed in a Christian and an English country.

Words of sufficient strength seem to be wanting to express the feelings of anti-vivisectionists. Hellish, monstrous, abominable, horrid, horrible, devilish, diabolical, demoniacal, ghastly, sinful, wicked, detestable, villanous, atrocious, nameless, infamous—such are a few of the adjectives most commonly applied to the practice, and it seems difficult to suggest stronger ones. Yet, from the way in which the writers pile up the agony, they evidently think their language inadequate to the occasion. I noticed one letter, occupying half a column of small print, in a London evening paper, which might be described as one continuous yell of indignation from beginning to end. Mr. George Duckett, of the Society for the Abolition of Vivisection, probably gave a form to the suppressed feelings of many, when he described vivisection as hellish, horrid, and monstrous, as "an abomination imported from the Continent," and as "going hand in hand with Atheism."<sup>1</sup>

It is noticeable that not a few of the eminent men who have practised vivisection, or are immediately interested in its results, express almost equally strong feelings. Mr. Darwin, when asked what he would think of trying a painful experiment without anæsthetics, when it could be done as well with them, replied emphatically, "It deserves detestation and abhorrence." (Question 4,672.) Dr. Sharpey, referring to one of Majendie's experiments,

(1) Report of the Royal Commission on Vivisection, p. 326.

which he had witnessed in his youth, described it as "his famous, it might rather have been called infamous," experiment (Question 474). Other less eminent witnesses spoke almost in a similar tone of practices in which they were themselves deeply interested.

I hope that I should be one of the last to deny that it is hellish, and infamous, and detestable, and so forth, to inflict needless pain on the lower animals. But I wish to ask, If so, why does society, and English society especially, go on permitting the perpetration of hellish atrocities, on a most gigantic scale, in their very midst? Why does it allow practices of this hellish description to be fashionable amusements of the upper classes, patronised by royalty, purchased at vast cost, commented on by all the daily press, and by a number of special journals, as if these amusements were more important to humanity than all science and art put together? Can anybody deny that what is known as "sport," or as the "noble science," including hunting, coursing, deer-stalking, shooting, battue-shooting, pigeon-shooting, and angling, is, from beginning to end, mere diversion founded on the needless sufferings of the lower animals. On what sociological or psychological grounds can we explain the fact that a comparatively small amount of pain inflicted for the lofty purpose of furthering science and relieving the ills of mortality should excite such intense feelings of disgust, while the infliction of almost infinitely greater amounts of pain in mere trivial amusement seems to excite no corresponding feeling at all? Why is the country agitated with disgust at the report of a cock-fight, or a combat between a man and a dog, or the electrifying of a horse, while the newspapers send their special correspondents to India to describe the achievements of our future emperor in sticking pigs?

It might seem indispensable, in treating a question of this sort, to lay down some clear definition, showing what is cruelty and what is not; but any attempt to reconcile popular sentiments with a single definition of the term will utterly fail. To inflict pain for the pleasure of inflicting it, is unquestionable and malignant cruelty. To inflict pain negligently, and without any adequate motive, as when a butcher, habituated to the slaughtering of animals, pays little regard to the shortening of their last agonies, is also cruel. But it would not seem that the infliction of pain is always regarded as a necessary ingredient of cruelty. A large part of the public strongly condemns the practice of pigeon-shooting as a cruel and brutal amusement. But a bird when fairly shot dies instantaneously, without time to feel pain, and when the business is properly conducted no bird need be left in pain for more than a very brief time. But there can be no doubt whatever that, in shooting wild birds and rabbits, a large proportion of the animals are painfully wounded, and yet escape beyond the reach of the sportsman. Wyndham, in a

remarkable speech which he made in favour of bull-baiting, asserted that in shooting there were ten birds wounded for one bird killed. I should think, or at least hope, that this is an immense exaggeration ; in the absence of any data I will assume that, for ten birds or rabbits killed outright, there is only one painfully wounded. Now we can hardly suppose that the number of birds and rabbits shot annually in this kingdom is less than thirty millions, and we arrive at the fearful result that, to say the least, three million animals are painfully mangled yearly, partly to supply food, but mainly to afford amusement to the wealthy. Let us grant, for the sake of argument, that only half of these animals could be taken painlessly by nets. Then we must allow that a million and a half wounded animals suffer agonies for the mere diversion of our sporting classes. Strange to say, this enormous infliction of needless pain is seldom thought cruel. True sport is held to be a wholesome manly exercise. Pigeon-shooting is cruel, although the animals die speedily and certainly. Rabbit-shooting is not cruel, apparently because the poor wounded animals which escape die a lingering death out of sight.

It may be said that the sportsman does nothing more than the laws of nature authorise. He procures food by the most direct process, and kills animals in a rapid painless way. But this does not at all hold good of all sporting. From my own observation I can affirm that many sportsmen acquire a taste for the simple wanton destruction of life apart from all ulterior purposes. Provided an animal will only make a good moving target they want to shoot it. They will do this at sea, in woods, and inaccessible places where there is no possibility of recovering the animals, or of putting them out of pain if badly wounded. In Norway and Australia I have frequently seen the sporting instinct of the English develop itself in freedom, and I can only conclude that "sport" is synonymous with the love of the clever destruction of living things.

We should not speak of sportsmen as if they were all exactly alike, and I have no doubt that many of them would hate to leave an animal in pain when they could help it ; but not so in every case. I have had narrated to me the proceedings of a highly aristocratic party, engaged in the fashionable amusement of battue-shooting. A wounded bird fell near to a group of country people, who were looking on at their superiors. The poor bird lay writhing in agony on the ground, and a bystander almost instinctively stepped forward to put it out of pain. He received such a rating from some of the aristocratic party for his impertinence as he has not forgotten to the present day, nor is likely to forget.

It does not seem possible to acquit women, especially women of distinction and fashion, of indirect participation in most extensive

acts of cruelty. I do not lay so much weight as some do upon their attendance at pigeon-shooting matches. Many a fine lady would turn sick at the notion of seeing a chicken slaughtered for her own table, who would sit by and compliment men on their skill in riddling pigeons and doves. There are fine distinctions in matters of this sort. But what I chiefly refer to is the irresistible tendency of women to ornament their hats and bonnets with the wings of birds. We speak of being "as happy as a bird," yet all over the world a shocking destruction of the most happy and beautiful little creatures which exist is occasioned by the vanity of women, and especially by those who may pretend to be the most educated and sensitive. There are women who seem to become hysterical at the very name of vivisection. Has it occurred to them that by doing away with the use of birds' wings and feathers they would prevent the lingering painful deaths, not simply of scores, or hundreds, or thousands, but of millions of sensitive animals? We should always remember that for each hundred birds shot, killed, and secured, there are ten, twenty, or perhaps more, which lie fatally wounded for hours or even days.

In connection with this subject of cruelty, I confess that a disagreeable truth is perpetually forced upon my mind, namely, that the amusements of the lower classes are readily denounced as cruel, while the sports of the squire and the aristocrat are held up as noble, though involving far more pain to animals. At one time there were local by-laws of manors, providing that no bull should be killed before it had been baited for the amusement of the people. But about the beginning of this century, when the manorial system had quite broken down, it was discovered that bull-baiting was a brutal and demoralizing exhibition, and it was forthwith repressed. Yet to the present day it is thought a fine thing to turn out a stag and chase it for hours in mortal agony, afterwards caging it up for another run. Some years ago I saw a revolting account in the papers of the way in which some Yorkshire squires had similarly conducted a beaver hunt, if I recollect aright. Yet when we come to think about it, I do not know that, except in being unusual, there is anything worse in such hunts than in ordinary fox-hunting—"the noble science," as it is called. What, I should like to know, is there noble in it, except that many "noblemen" pursue it? A score or two of strong men, mounted on the fleetest horses, with a pack of highly trained hounds, pursue one wretched little palpitating animal. It is true that Professor Newman, in his recent interesting article on Cruelty, endeavours to show very ingeniously that hunted animals do not suffer much, the physical exertion banishing the anguish of fear. Swift animals, he considers, are made to run. The real dread of death, he thinks, is felt when we sit in ambush and

hear our enemies, as Idomeneus in Homer said, compassing our death. But surely the hunted fox must suffer this too when he gets into cover, and hears the dogs snuffing around him, or when he runs to earth and has to be dug out. I am told, too, that a hunted animal, supposing him to escape death, suffers very severely from cramp in the over-strained muscles. I see nothing in fox-hunting to render it otherwise than highly cruel, except that it is "noble." I fear, too, that the principal difference to be drawn between coursing and baiting, is that the latter is the form of sport most likely to fall within the means of the lower classes.

From these and many other instances, which will readily suggest themselves, we may learn that the popular notions of cruelty depend in a comparatively slight degree upon the real amount of pain inflicted. The attitude of mind of the inflicter, the circumstances of the infliction, the degree or way in which the pain is made manifest, and especially the frequency with which the act has been done in past times, or the social grade of those by whom it is usually done, are all taken into account.

Cruelty is, in fact, a highly complex notion, involving several distinct elements involved together in a most subtle manner. It is only by the aid of the new sciences of Sociology and Anthropology—with the guidance, in short, of Mr. Spencer or Mr. Tylor—that we can attempt to explain the apparent inconsistencies which meet us on every side in moral and social questions of this kind. But we may perhaps classify the elements of cruelty under four principal heads, as follows:—

Firstly, the actual physical pain inflicted.

Secondly, the motive or purpose of inflicting the pain, or rather of performing the action which produces pain.

Thirdly, the degree in which the action in question is habitual and familiar.

Fourthly, the manner in which the pain is expressed and the circumstances of its infliction impressed upon the imagination.

We might call these elements of cruelty respectively, the *physical*, the *moral*, the *sociological*, and the *psychological elements*. Different acts of cruelty involve these elements in the most various proportions. When hyænas were made to jump through blazing hoops, this was at once pronounced to be gross cruelty, because it conflicted with our notions of what is habitual and recognised. When a man was prosecuted in Scotland for barbarously beating some sporting dogs in the process of training them, the sheriff held that this was not cruelty, because you could not have sporting dogs without training them. Here the element of habit comes in palpably. Sporting dogs are required for man's amusement, and the leaping hyænas were also employed to amuse visitors to the menagerie. What then is the

difference, except in the familiarity of the amusement, unless indeed we remember that sporting dogs are chiefly wanted by the aristocratic classes?

The country is shocked now to hear that horses have been occasionally tamed by electricity in Yorkshire. Here the sociological element is again predominant. Horses may be tamed by any of the methods approved by our forefathers, though there is no proof that they are less painful; but the notion of using an electric shock for the purpose has given a moral shock to the country. In the same way we may explain the grotesqueness of the proposal made in that remarkable work, "The Unseen Universe," to punish criminals by the electric battery. You may starve a criminal, shut him up in a dark cell, or tear his back with the cat, but you must not do anything which conflicts so much with our notions of the proper and habitual as to call in the aid of science. It may be that electricity would give the most deterrent effect with the least permanent injury; but it would still be cruel on the sociological ground.

The psychological element in cruelty has regard to the degree in which the pain of the animal is made apparent to the spectator, and forced upon his imagination. There is a curious instance to this effect in the life of William Roscoe,<sup>1</sup> who tells us that in early life he spent many hours in strolling along the shore of the Mersey, or in fishing. But on one occasion, as he says in his own words, "I determined to become a sportsman; and having procured a gun, and found an unfortunate thrush perched on a branch of a tree, I brought him to the ground with fatal aim; but I was so horrified and disgusted with the agonies which I saw him endure in death, that I have never since repeated the experiment." William Roscoe, then, drew the line of cruelty between fish and fowl. The helpless flopping and struggling of the hooked fish did not impress upon him the sense of pain with sufficient acuteness to overpower the satisfaction of success. But the writhing of a tortured bird was an expression of suffering too strong to bear. I believe that much of the obloquy so wrongly cast upon Dr. Ferrier arose from his operating upon monkeys, whose grimaces, as described by him, approached too nearly to a human form. That this is so we may perhaps infer from the indignation expended upon the case of the unfortunate patient experimented on by an American medical man, as described in the *Spectator* of March 20th, 1875, and discussed in subsequent numbers. The woman was dying of a mortal disease, her brain was already exposed, she consented to the experiments, which were also painless. Yet the idea of sticking needles into her brain and exciting spasmodic movements and grimaces by electricity was held to be so cruel, although painless, that the operator left the country. Cruelty,

(1) The "Life of William Roscoe," by his Son Henry Roscoe. 1833. Vol. i. p. 11.

then, does not necessarily involve the infliction of any appreciable pain; it may consist in the production of expressions which merely suggest ideas of pain. The psychological element of cruelty may, then, become so important as itself to constitute cruelty almost entirely. It is not the knowledge, in a logical sort of way, that pain is needlessly and wantonly inflicted upon the lower animals which excites popular indignation, otherwise why does the sporting spirit meet with approval rather than disgust? Cruel actions, according to popular esteem, are simply those which bring the fact and intensity of pain too much before the imagination. It is something in the same way that we are more affected by hearing of one man killed half a mile off, than of ten thousand people perishing in an unknown part of China or South America.

The same perplexing difference of sentiments will be found to occur again as regards the rat-catching business. It is well known that there is a regular trade in live rats, which are caught in cage-traps, and then supplied at regular market prices to dog-fanciers, who want either to train young ratting dogs or to exhibit the powers of their pets. A great many people would call this traffic in rats a base cruel thing; but this can hardly be on account of physical pain caused to the rats. They can suffer but little in the cage-traps, and a skilful ratting-dog disposes of a rat at a single toss. The same people who would denounce the cruelty of ratting, never bestow a thought upon those dreadful serrated steel traps, actuated by a powerful spring, which catch the unhappy animal by any part of his body—head, trunk, legs, or tail—which happens to be within reach. Often must an animal caught in such a trap suffer for hours, and even for days, torments quite equal to those of the vivisection table without chloroform, the pangs of hunger being super-added. In these days of inventive progress it would be very easy to devise traps which would kill rats and mice instantaneously, and with certainty. If the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has offered prizes for the invention of such traps, or has taken any steps to reduce the immense amount of pain caused by the present traps, such efforts have not come to my knowledge.

Turning, now, to the Report of the Royal Commission on Vivisection, my own impression is very strong to the effect that no abuses of the practice of any importance have been proved. The rumours and hearsay evidence about the frequent private vivisections by students did not usually bear cross-examination, though in one town it is clear that a kind of small club of students had been experimenting. The story of the old horse kept for the purpose of practising operations in a veterinary school is also an unpleasant one (Questions 5,037—5,043). But if we allow that there was some cruelty in this single case, I do not think there is



any need to expend much sentimental indignation upon it. The witness who made this case known was obliged to allow in his answers to other questions (5,054—5,052) that he had himself performed a far more painful operation on horses, namely that of firing them, without always taking the trouble to give them chloroform. The same witness denounced "the fearful cruelty" with which a particular dog had been treated by some students. Examination, however, showed (Questions 5,009—5,030) that the intention had been to kill the dog in the manner usually considered the least objectionable, namely, by the administration of prussic acid. The dose having perhaps been insufficient, the dog soon afterwards showed signs of life, and some students tried the effect of a little ammonia as an antidote. Having become partially sensible, it was promptly killed by a blow on the head. The dog probably suffered no pain, or as little as might be; and I see nothing so cruel in it as for a sportsman to shoot a bird, and then depart without taking the trouble to ascertain whether it is killed or only wounded.

A great deal of attention was given to the case of certain dogs which had been killed by strychnine in the presence of medical students, for the purpose of demonstrating the action of that fearful poison. As regards the physical pain caused, I see no grounds for complaint, while it is permitted for the squatters of Queensland to kill the native dogs in large numbers by strychnine. If the use of this poison is in itself cruel, then the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty should take means to prohibit its general use. It is on moral and psychological grounds, then, that the exhibition of the effects of the poison are to be objected to, if at all. But nobody denied that a medical man ought to learn the symptoms of strychnine poisoning, which might not only be met with in practice, but are very instructive in other respects. It was given in evidence by several high authorities that no one could adequately conceive the action of strychnine without witnessing it. So that the question really is whether medical students are to be prevented from gaining necessary knowledge in the most effective way, because it will harden and scar their moral natures to see an animal killed for the purpose.

It seems to me, speaking as one having no practical acquaintance with such matters, that if the exhibition of poisoned dogs is objectionable, then a great part of the clinical instruction of medical students is objectionable. Are students, for instance, to be allowed to study patients dying of hydrophobia or other dreadful diseases? To allow the general public heedlessly to see such painful sights would be disgusting, simply because it would be encouraging a morbid pleasure in the witnessing of pain. But it is a necessary part of the education of a medical man, not only to learn the nature of the diseases, but to harden his nerves, and to acquire the power

of encountering the most dreadful cases of human suffering without losing his presence of mind. It is in clinical practice he acquires this power, and it seems to me out of the question, that after coolly scrutinizing human suffering in all its worst phases, his moral nature will be destroyed by seeing the poisoning of a dog. No doubt it is a question admitting of discussion how far the constant witnessing of pain blunts the moral nature. But so far as I can judge of the medical men with whom I am acquainted, their moral natures have sustained no injuries. On the contrary, they are in general among the most humane of men, and all their affections and sympathies have been in no degree weakened by the painful scenes they constantly witness. Now, if this be so, I am quite unable to see how the exhibition, in a reasonable and necessary degree, of experiments upon the lower animals, conducted in as painless a way as the nature of the experiment allows, can have the dreadful moral consequences attributed to it by the anti-vivisectionists. As regards the physical element of cruelty, the student may well reflect that infinitely greater amounts of pain are daily inflicted, with the approval of the community, by the sportsman and the ratcatcher. As regards the moral element, he may feel assured that an able and experienced teacher would not exhibit useless experiments.

There is one thing which I much regret in this bitter discussion, namely, that questionable motives are imputed to those who practise vivisection for the purpose of research. Like most warm and intemperate partizans, anti-vivisectionists can see no good in those they pursue, and failing to convince people that experiments on animals are useless, they wish to make them out to be cruel on the second or moral ground, namely, that the experiments are performed merely for the purpose of gaining reputation or "notoriety," as they call it dyslogistically. They would have us believe that men like Dr. Ferrier or Dr. Michael Foster, although they may be discovering truths of some importance to suffering humanity, are not really doing it from humane motives. But can anything be more gratuitous and unfair? In the absence of any special reason, I altogether question our right to pry into private motives. If the experiments are well performed, and the results are, or are likely to be, in a fair proportion of cases, useful to mankind, I think that the private motives of the observer are not a matter for public animadversion. The law distinctly takes this view, allowing the fullest freedom of criticism upon an author's works, but treating remarks upon his moral character and private affairs in a very different way.

But assuming that we must discuss the question of motives, what can be more gratuitous than to question the pure intentions of vivisectors, while we leave physicists, chemists, geologists, and all

other classes of discoverers, unchallenged? Can it be that a selfish love of notoriety is the spring of those exertions which have benefited mankind with all the progress of the sciences and arts? I have been astonished to see that one witness before the Commission, himself a scientific man of the highest standing, holds all original research to be selfish and demoralising. He said (Question 1,287), speaking of vivisection: "It is amenable to abuse when employed for the purposes of research; and I must say that, with regard to all absorbing studies, that is the besetting sin of them, and of original research, that they lift a man so entirely above the ordinary sphere of daily duty that they betray him into selfishness and unscrupulous neglect of duty." And again he says: "I mean to say that vivisection, in its application to research, may be somewhat more demoralising than other kinds of devotion to research; every kind of original research being a gratification of self, and liable to develop selfishness, which of course is the root of all unscrupulousness." Did ever a scientific man take so extraordinary a view of the moral aspects of the work in which he was engaged? I had previously been under the impression that, of all kinds of occupations, the labours of the scientific discoverer are least open to the charge of selfishness. The labours of the engineer, lawyer, banker, merchant, are not specially selfish, but they often result in the acquisition of so much riches that the individual may fairly aspire to the pleasure of shooting his own partridges, or even renting a grouse moor. But I should like to know how far the salary received by a professor of practical physiology, in respect of his skilful cutting up of dogs and cats, would go, after the payment of household expenses, towards the purchase of the privilege of slaughtering birds in the fashionable way. The vivisector, like most discoverers in pure science, must look for his reward in the pleasure of pursuing knowledge for its own sake, or for the sake of the millions of men who will in the future be benefited by his discoveries. Of course, I do not mean to say that the vivisector has clearly before his mind in each experiment the good of mankind generally. Men are usually driven to work for a great end by some instinctive tendency, some pleasure in the action itself, or some minor motive, just as the bee gathers a store of honey, not because he is conscious of its future utility, but because it is agreeable to gather it. We approve the industrious actions of the bee because they lead to a useful end, and it is quite sufficient defence of the vivisector's character that his labours are likely to result in the diminution of disease and suffering.

Moreover, suppose that the vivisector is consciously urged on by the love of reputation or fame, I have yet to learn that there is anything immoral or selfish in such love. Milton has described the love of fame as "that last infirmity of noble minds." To call it

the love of notoriety is to use a question-begging epithet, assuming that vivisection is a cruel and morally bad practice. Notoriety is reputation gained by bad means, or those injurious to the community; fame is reputation gained by good means, or those beneficial to the community. There are not the slightest grounds upon which to attribute notoriety to the vivisector, while we attribute fame to the great statesman, orator, artist, engineer. And the desire of reputation, too, may be merely the desire of means towards an unselfish end. One who aspires to repeat the labours of a Harvey, a Jenner, or a Simpson, might well adopt the words which Tennyson has put into the mouth of Merlin :—

“Fame with men,  
Being but ampler means to serve mankind  
Should have small rest or pleasure in herself,  
But work as vassal to the larger love,  
That dwarfs the petty love of one to one.  
Use gave me Fame at first, and Fame again  
Increasing gave me Use. Lo, there my boon!  
What other? for men sought to prove me vile.  
\*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*  
Right well I know that Fame is half disfame,  
Yet needs must work my work.”

Looking to all the circumstances, we must conclude that this agitation against vivisection consists in a kind of sentimental frenzy, excited in persons of peculiar susceptibility by the minute descriptions of novel and sometimes painful operations described in books on practical physiology. The actual amount of pain inflicted cannot really be the ground of agitation, because, on any supposition, the physical pain needlessly inflicted by sportsmen, ratcatchers, and others, is infinitely greater. As I have already maintained, the moral element of cruelty is altogether wanting in vivisection—in all but a very few cases. It is merely the novelty of the thing to people's minds, the apparent villany and cool-bloodedness of cutting live animals, which excites the imagination. Sociology and psychology enable us perfectly to comprehend the frenzy of the Anti-Vivisection Society, but science and common sense will teach us to bear a slight wound to our sympathetic feelings that we may secure immeasurable blessings for future generations. Vaccination has already saved more lives than all the wars of Napoleon destroyed. Chloroform has prevented inconceivable amounts of pain. From the continued application of experiment to physiology we may look for other gifts such as these. “Where the pursuit of scientific truth and common compassion come into collision, it seems to me that the ends of civilisation, no less than of morality, require us to be guided by the latter or higher principle.” So says Mr. Hutton in his separate report as member of the Commission;

but the pursuit of scientific truth is the highest and most civilising and most compassionate work in which a man can engage. If he holds that we may not cause pain to a dog that we may save greater pain to a thousand human beings, then further argument would be useless. Mr. Hutton also seems to think that it is more justifiable to make experiments upon sheep, in a way likely to benefit other sheep, than if we experiment purely in the interests of man. We may injure one sensitive creature for the good of other creatures of the same rank, but not for the good of creatures of higher or, I suppose, lower rank. If this be his meaning, I can only allow that he possesses moral sentiments of a kind to which I am wholly a stranger.

I do not believe that there is any need for legislation in this matter at all. It is undesirable that students should privately practise vivisection, and it is most desirable that anæsthetics should be employed to the utmost possible extent; but after the attention of the public has been so strongly drawn to the subject, it is very unlikely that the slight abuses shown to have occurred will be repeated. The professors of practical physiology will have every reason to keep a watch, and they are more likely to be able to restrain their students than the police or the societies; but if prosecutions like that of M. Magnan are to be repeated, it will be necessary to protect vivisection by legislation, giving the duly qualified dissector a licence to make experiments, somewhat as provided in Dr. Playfair's bill.

In view of the infinite benefits to mankind and the lower animals which we may confidently anticipate from this tardy application of true scientific method to the phenomena of life, it is altogether out of the question that we should attempt to repress or hinder vivisection. Legislation should be directed to legalising the practice on the part of those who are most likely to conduct it usefully, skilfully, and, as far as circumstances will allow, painlessly.

W. STANLEY JEVONS.

## SOME OF THE RESULTS OF THE EDUCATION ACT AND CODE OF 1870.

THERE is an aspect of the Education question so purely administrative that some hope may be entertained that the results of recent legislation may be subjected to an analysis as free from political or religious controversy as questions of natural science ought to be. The Government has become responsible only for the secular instruction in the school, and takes little cognizance of its external relations. An examination might be made of the consequences of the Education Act 1870, as to the increase of the number, resources, and efficiency of the inspected schools, without entering into any other matter affecting the preference of one class of schools over another, or lying beyond the region of their secular success.

The intention of this paper, after a few preliminary remarks indispensable for a right understanding of what follows, is to make such an analysis of some of the results of the Education Act up to the period of the latest statistics, on the 31st of August, 1875.

The origin of efforts for the education of the manual labour class made during the last hundred years cannot be traced to the Civil Power. It was otherwise at the Reformation, and during the reigns of Edward VI., Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., when the Free Grammar Schools were founded chiefly by appropriations of ecclesiastical property, and were made accessible to all who had leisure and means to avail themselves of these advantages. Not a few of the children of yeomen, of humble tradesmen, and even some sons of artisans, or labourers, were educated in these schools. This provision was made, to a great extent, in the interest of the reformed ecclesiastical polity. But, after the Commonwealth, the interference of the Civil Power to promote education was intermittent and feeble.

The Sunday schools were founded, in the last century, by Christian charity. They gave rise to the day schools of the religious communities. For the promotion of such schools, the National School Society came to represent the Church, and the British and Foreign School Society chiefly the Congregational Dissenters and the Society of Friends. There were also many private adventure schools. But very few elementary schools were founded by any civil authority. Until 1832, these two societies had received neither recognition nor aid from the Government, though their schools, founded and supported by voluntary contributions, had even then become numerous.

The first interference of the Government asserted no authority, and gave little evidence of interest. Parliament was moved, in 1832, to vote £20,000 to be distributed in grants to promote the building of schools connected with these two associations. The amount of the grants was determined by the area of the school-rooms, but no conditions were imposed as to the scholastic or sanitary structure of the buildings. Neither plans, nor specifications, nor school deeds were submitted. The stability of the schoolhouses and the security of the trust were to be assured by the two societies, without any inspection or check from the Government. This grant of £20,000 was annually voted until 1839, when the Treasury had distributed £140,000 in aid of voluntary contributions for the building of schools.

But the growth of the sense of the political and social importance of national education had been more rapid than this increase of the number of schools. Yet even this conviction was in 1839 by no means general. It was almost confined to leading statesmen, economists, and members of Parliament. The desire to plant the Christian faith, by making the Bible an open book to the masses, stimulated the compassion and zeal of the religious bodies to efforts and sacrifices. But out of the range of this desire there was rather a dread that education might unfit the workman for manual labour.

When, therefore, the Government founded the Committee of Council on Education, in 1839, and increased the amount of the annual grant, there was no other civil authority or organization as zealous for popular education as were the religious communions and their associations. The day schools which existed were in their hands, and had become numerous. The several representative bodies entrusted with local government were occupied each with some administrative improvement. With rare exceptions, they would have been little inclined to exercise any power which might have been confided to them for the founding and management of schools. On the other hand, there was among the religious communions a burning zeal to establish and support schools—a zeal which even regarded all action of the civil power with jealousy, and claimed as a function of the clergy, or of the church or congregation, authority to bring up the youth of this country in the Christian faith. The Government could not, however, divest itself of responsibility for all the purely civil aspects of education. The new Department had primarily to solve the question how the schools of the religious communions could be made efficient for all secular purposes, while the responsibility for religious instruction continued to be charged on the church and the congregation.

In attempting the solution of this problem, the Department had to encounter various antagonistic forces, which regarded each succe-

sive advance of the civil power as an encroachment on a province, either occupied by the schools already founded, or claimed for the religious communions. Some, therefore, of the proposals of the Government were subjected by suspicion to defeat, and others were modified. It was only possible to vindicate the reasonableness of the interference of the Executive by its beneficial character. Thus the Education Department commenced by securing the stability of the school buildings, their scholastic and sanitary fitness, and the permanency of the trust. They then caused the laity to be associated in the management of all schools built with public aid. They established the inspection of schools, and, on this basis, devised a scheme of annual grants, conditional on the degree of efficiency attained. By means of these grants, they took the first steps towards securing a better remuneration to the teachers, and the introduction of a more adequate and better qualified teaching staff. To this end, the pupil teacher system was introduced, and was afterwards promoted by the Minutes of 1846, as the first step towards the introduction of adult assistant masters. To ensure the success of the training of the apprentices, of the selection of Queen's scholars, and of their subsequent education in training colleges, the entire scheme was placed under precise regulations, enforced by a vigilant inspection and examination. Training Colleges—first founded in 1840—were gradually built with aid from the Government, and were supported by liberal grants, conditional on their efficiency.

But a large part of the schools of the religious communions shrank from the public inspection. The fulfilment of the conditions of the annual grants involved some loss of independence, considerable sacrifices and exertions, and seemed to lead to such a predominance of the secular elements of instruction as might end in the substitution of purely secular schools connected with the civil government, for schools founded, governed, and supported by the religious bodies. The child might, it was feared, be claimed by the State, to be brought up as a citizen in free schools, in which the parental obligation and authority would be superseded, and from which religious influence would be banished. Accordingly, the Minutes of 1846, which established the system of annual grants, very slowly attracted the co-operation of the previously-founded voluntary schools, though they were in great need both of the support of the grants and of the stimulus of the administrative action to make them efficient. In March, 1861, the Duke of Newcastle's Commission reported that in 1858 there were 22,647 schools (departments) supported by religious denominations, with 1,549,312 scholars, and 357 schools with 43,098 scholars not specially connected with religious denominations.<sup>1</sup>

(1) Report of Commissioners on state of Popular Education, vol. i. p. 20.



"Of the children thus enumerated, 917,255 were, in 1860, on the books of schools in the receipt of aid from the Committee of Council." There were, therefore, "675,155 scholars in public schools of the class for which the grants were intended, but which derived no annual advantage from them." But if the private schools of the same class, containing probably 573,536 children, were "added to the scholars in unassisted public schools, they would make a total of 1,248,691 children to whose education the annual grant did not contribute."<sup>1</sup>

Even in 1866 the National Society reported that there were 6,955 Church of England day schools not in the receipt of annual grants, which were on the average attended by 431,523 scholars.

If, therefore, these schools could be rendered efficient by being brought under the influence of the administration of the Education Department, thus becoming subject to inspection, and to the conditions of the annual grants, there was here a large reserve which, by being made part of the machinery of national education, would assist the Government in covering the country with efficient schools. The recommendations of the Commission in 1861 were directed to the attainment of this result, but owing to a change of policy in the Education Department, little further progress was made up to 1870.

In 1869 upwards of one million scholars were on the average under daily instruction in 13,644 inspected departments of schools receiving annual grants. They were taught by 25,342 principal assistant and pupil teachers.<sup>2</sup>

The schools were supported at an annual cost of £1,389,674 2s. 8d., of which £464,943 19s. 3d. was derived from the Government.

Large as had been the results attained, it had long been foreseen that some supplementary action was needed, both to attract the independent voluntary schools within the sphere of departmental influence, and also to cover the whole of England and Wales with schools, so that in the most obscure, impoverished, or apathetic districts, a reasonably efficient education might be accessible to every child. The conviction that some supplementary action would be ultimately indispensable had caused in 1851-2 the preparation of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill, and in 1852-3 of Lord Russell's Boroughs Bill, both of which were intended to take the first step towards making a charge on the local rates, in aid of the resources of the religious communions and of the parliamentary grants.

Though these and similar proposals did not become law, they

(1) Report of Commissioners on state of Popular Education, vol. i., p. 83.

(2) Certificated head teachers	11,752
Assistant teachers	1,233
Pupil teachers	12,357
Total	25,342

served to keep the public attention fixed on the question of the best plan of supplementary action, by which the work, so far prosperously in progress, could be completed.

In the Report of the Education Department for 1874-5 (p. xiv.), the following estimate is given of the whole amount of work to be done:—"It has been calculated that under the operation of the Education Acts, the average attendance" in each department under a head teacher "will rise to 120, and assuming that at least 3,250,000 children in England and Wales ought to be in attendance on public elementary schools, it would follow that about 27,000 departments, under certificated teachers, will be required as the general school supply of the country." According to this estimate, the number of departments which were inspected in 1869 had to be nearly doubled (*i.e.* augmented from 13,611 to 27,000), and the number of principal certificated teachers and adult assistants increased from 12,985 to 27,000. Also, 2,000,000 more of children would have to be on the average in attendance to satisfy the requirements of the Department.

This estimate of deficiency of course proceeds on the presumption that the voluntary and private elementary schools existing outside the system of schools inspected and aided by public grants, could not be regarded as efficient for the objects of a national system, though they might become so.

The Education Act and Code of 1870 were intended to supply this deficiency by two modes of action. First, by stimulating the activity of the religious communions. To this end the building grants were continued, if claimed within a short period. The original draft of the Bill also provided for assistance from the rates towards the annual expenses of voluntary schools. This was afterwards commuted into an increase of the rate of aid from the annual grants, which was intended to make an augmentation of 50 per cent. attainable by adequate exertions and sacrifices. A much more doubtful and dangerous concession was introduced into the Code, by which certificates of the third class might be granted *without examination*, upon the report of an inspector, to acting teachers, if males, above thirty-five, and, if females, above thirty years of age, who had been teachers in schools above ten years. It is to be regretted that this certificate *was not limited to competency to conduct the school in which the teacher was found*, instead of opening to him other and more important schools. This regulation was to continue in operation to March 31, 1876, and was intended to bring well-conducted schools within the conditions of the annual grants. These facts sufficiently indicate that the Ministry had no intention to subvert voluntary schools, but rather to increase their number and efficiency, by aid towards their construction, by assistance to the

annual expenses, and by removing obstacles which had till then prevented many voluntary schools from fulfilling the conditions of the grants.

The task of providing an efficient education for more than two millions of additional scholars was so great that the Government invited the aid of that voluntary force which had already provided instruction for upwards of one million in inspected schools, both to build new schools and to reinforce the national system from that reserve of independent schools which had hitherto declined to co-operate with the Education Department. If these two millions of scholars had to be instructed at the expense of the ratepayers, and if the sum raised from the rates did not exceed that average outlay per head in 1874-5, an annual local burden of upwards of two millions would have to be borne in addition to the parliamentary grants.

But if the action of the School Boards were subversive, and the voluntary schools were absorbed, and supported only by the rates and school pence, nearly £700,000, voluntarily contributed in 1875 in aid of school expenditure would be lost. Also £94,640 of endowments could only be made applicable by force of law. If, also the annual cost of these schools were generally raised to the school board level of 1875, £402,473 of additional expense would have to be incurred.<sup>1</sup> The entire outlay for the instruction of 3,250,000 children, at the board school rate of outlay<sup>2</sup> for 1874-5, would be £5,998,958, of which £3,365,104 would be a charge on the rates, and the rest derived from school pence and the parliamentary grants.

Much doubt may be felt whether the popular feeling in favour of elementary education is such that so large a *local* burden would be welcome. On the contrary, grave apprehension may be entertained that a resistance to the amount of such charges on the rates would seriously cripple the resources of schools even if it did not prevent the increase of their number.

There were, therefore, very grave reasons why, in proposing the Education Act 1870, the Department should avail itself, for a reasonable period, of the assistance of the denominations in founding new schools, and of the reserve of force which the religious communions possessed in those voluntary schools which had not accepted the public aid.

The results of this policy are remarkable. The amount of accommodation, at eight square feet per scholar, which on the 31st August, 1870, existed in denominational schools inspected and aided by

(1) If, according to the wishes of an extreme party, these schools were all to be free, the school pence contributed in inspected schools in the year ended 31st August, 1875, amounting to £933,665, would also be sacrificed and charged on the rates.

(2) £1 16s. 11d. See Table (No. 2), Statistics of Inspection of Annual Grant Schools.

annual grants was sufficient for 1,878,584 children. This had increased to accommodation for 3,146,424 scholars in public elementary schools<sup>1</sup> on the 31st August, 1875. Of this *increase*, 880,440 places existed in voluntary, and 386,400 in Board schools. On December 31st, 1875, the increase in accommodation in new buildings of voluntary schools since 31st December, 1870, amounted to provision for 276,494,<sup>2</sup> children. These buildings had been erected at a cost of £1,606,298, of which £318,488 was derived from grants. The remaining space for 603,946 scholars must be attributed either to schools built since 1870 without the government aid, or to the number of independent voluntary schools, which had availed themselves of the augmented grants, had submitted to inspection, and had become public elementary schools under the Education Act. No doubt the Article 59 of the Code facilitated, in many cases, this result, and the dread of a mixed school board caused the Timetable Conscience Clause to be regarded as a lesser difficulty.

The impulse given to the voluntary organization of the religious communions in building schools, and the results of the attraction of independent schools within the administrative action of the Education Department, and of the work of the School Boards are shown by the following contrast:—

				Increase.
Number of Departments under separate head teachers <sup>3</sup>	14,565	19,245	4,680	
Number of scholars for whom accommodation is provided	1,878,584	3,146,424	1,267,840	
Number of scholars in average attendance	1,152,389	1,837,180	684,791	
Number of certificated teachers	12,467 <sup>4</sup>	20,940	8,473	
„ assistant „	1,262	2,713	1,451	
„ pupil „	14,304	29,667	15,363	

(1) Table No. 16.

(2) *Statistics of school buildings erected by voluntary subscriptions aided by grants in each year from 1870 to 1875.*

In years	Number for which accommodation has been provided.	Institutions built.	Departments.	Residences built.	Schools enlarged.	Grants made by Education Department.	Subscriptions.	Total.
						£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1870	24,238	75	156	46	93	26,570 8 3	112,715 12 2½	139,286 6 5½
1871	34,035	102	191	55	137	48,231 9 5	145,764 2 3	183,993 11 8
1872	86,742	343	533	148	221	94,176 4 0	389,925 13 0½	486,001 17 9½
1873	78,018	388	533	211	98	89,277 11 0	373,496 8 2	462,739 19 2
1874	85,397	139	214	77	81	40,323 19 7	172,166 2 0	212,496 1 7
1875	18,064	89	123	32		19,903 18 8	91,893 12 8	111,787 11 4
Total	276,494	1,086	1,750	569	689	318,488 10 11	1,295,851 10 3½	1,606,298 7 11½

(3) Table No. 16. N.B.—The statistics of teachers to December 31st, 1875, were given in Table No. 2, Part I.

(4) The numbers which are compared are those given in page ix. of Education Report for 1870-71, and in Table No. 1, Part II. of Statistics of Education Department, 1875-6.

These numbers comprise both the voluntary and the Board schools, but it is important to distinguish the increase in voluntary and in Board schools.

Between the 31st of August 1870 and the 31st of August 1875, 2,758 departments had been added to the public elementary schools in connection with the religious bodies. The average attendance of the scholars was augmented by 457,506 scholars taught by 17,836 additional teachers. The comparative progress of the Board schools is shown in the following table:—

*Additional number of schools, scholars, and teachers in Voluntary and Board schools since the passing of the Education Act, to 31st August, 1875.*

	Board Schools.	Increase in Voluntary Schools since 31st August, 1870.
Number of Departments . . . . .	1,922	2,758
Scholars present at examination . . . . .	280,594	506,385
Scholars on the average in daily attendance	227,285	457,503
	Teachers.	Increased number of Teachers.
Certificated head teachers	2,543 . . . . .	5,930
Assistant adult do. . . . .	455 . . . . .	996
Pupil teachers . . . . .	4,453 . . . . .	10,910
<hr/>		
Total number of teachers in Board Schools	} 7,451	Total increase in number of teachers and assistants in Voluntary Schools } 17,836

The position which the voluntary schools were stimulated and enabled to take as public elementary schools, by the provisions of the Education Act and Code of 1870, is quite as remarkable when the augmentation of their annual income is examined.

This increase since 1870, including government grants, amounted in 1875 to £1,021,545, and exclusive of the grants to £614,193.

The Board schools came into operation in 1872, and the comparative increase in the income of the two classes of schools after 1872 was as follows:—

Increase of annual income in Voluntary Schools since 1872, not including grants . . . . .	£427,020
Increase of the annual income of Board Schools, not including grants . . . . .	£306,746
Of this income in Board Schools £212,588 was derived from the rates.	
The increase of grants in Voluntary Schools since 1872 has been . . . . .	
And in Board Schools . . . . .	£277,786
	£75,655

A comparison of the comparative efficiency of different classes of schools ought to take into account all the circumstances interfering with success. The position of voluntary and Board schools differs widely in this respect; but the difficulties encountered by each

class respectively are so various as to make an exact comparison impossible. The Board schools are of very recent origin, and have often been built in districts inhabited by the poorest and most ignorant population of cities. They have encountered the evil consequences of previous neglect, in the gross ignorance and semi-barbarous manners of the inhabitants. But, the Boards having command of the rates, have built schools, in which no legitimate expense has been spared either in the structure or the fittings. They have attracted, by good emoluments, a large staff of the most experienced and skilful teachers. But in a migratory population insensible of the advantages of education, the difficulty of ensuring regular and continuous school attendance is almost insurmountable. Consequently the results of the earliest years in such schools are generally full of disappointment.

On the other hand, the average of the success of the denominational schools is reduced by the humbler attainments of the scholars in the inferior rural schools, and in those apathetic districts of towns, in which the managers find it impossible to maintain a staff of teachers equal to that which enables the Board schools to grapple with similar difficulties, and with a better prospect of success.

The time for a comparison of the results of the work of the different classes of schools cannot be said to have arrived. The statistics of the percentage which passed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and in the higher subjects, gives no remarkable indication of superiority in voluntary as compared with Board schools. The amount of the parliamentary grant awarded is perhaps as good a test of comparative efficiency as can be at present applied :—

	s.	d.	
In Church of England Schools the grants averaged	12	8½	per scholar
In British, Wesleyan, and other Schools . . . . .	13	0½	„
In Roman Catholic Schools . . . . .	12	10¾	„
In Board Schools . . . . .	11	5¼	„

The comparative income of the schools, per scholar on the average in attendance, was, for the year ending August 31, 1875<sup>1</sup> :—

	Including Annual Grant.			Excluding Annual Grant.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
In Church of England Schools . . . . .	1	11	6	0	1	0
In British, Wesleyan, and other Schools	1	11	6¾	0	19	11½
In Roman Catholic Schools . . . . .	1	8	3¾	0	16	10
In Board Schools . . . . .	1	17	2¾	1	9	9

The principal element of the success of schools consists in the efficiency and adequacy of the teaching staff. The School Boards

have been able to offer salaries attractive to the most experienced and skilful teachers, and to make the numbers and qualifications of their staff more equal to the difficulties which they have to encounter, than they could have done if they had not had command of the rates. Yet the average pecuniary emoluments of teachers in the voluntary schools show no marked disparity from those of the Board schools, when the number of teachers' residences is taken into account.<sup>1</sup>

The proportion of teachers to scholars, on the average in attendance in the year ending August 31, 1875, was in voluntary schools one for each 35 scholars, and in Board schools also one for each 35. The proportions of the several classes of teachers to the number of scholars were as in the table below.<sup>2</sup>

From the foregoing data there is no reason to conclude that hitherto there is any great difference in the efficiency of the two classes of schools. It must, however, be borne in mind that the School Boards have a power to make charges on the rates limited only by their discretion and sense of responsibility. Thus the Board schools may, in the structure of their school buildings, the completeness of their fittings and apparatus, the number and quali-

(1) SALARIES OF TEACHERS.

Denomination Schools connected with	Certificated Masters.			Certificated Mistresses.			Certificated Infants' Mistresses.		
	Average Pecuniary Emolu- ments, including all pro- fessional sources of income.	Num- ber from which aver- age is taken.	Num- ber pro- vided with house or rent free.	Average Pecuniary Emolu- ments, including all pro- fessional sources of income.	Num- ber from which aver- age is taken.	Num- ber pro- vided with house or rent free.	Average Pecuniary Emolu- ments, including all pro- fessional sources of income.	Num- ber from which aver- age is taken.	Num- ber pro- vided with house or rent free.
	£ s. d.			£ s. d.			£ s. d.		
National Society, or Church of England . . .	103 9 3	6,298	3,977	63 3 7	4,735	2,430	61 14 8	2,417	779
British, Wes- leyan, or other Schools not connected with Church of Eng- land . . .	128 12 6	1,083	411	72 18 0	721	121	70 7 4	527	64
Roman Catholic Schools . . .	98 10 6	251	42	60 5 0	570	152	57 2 7	264	56
School Board Schools . . .	115 19 3	1,054	282	76 10 7	709	89	73 11 11	523	33
Total or average	109 6 7	9,296	4,692	65 7 8	6,735	2,792	64 5 10	3,731	932

(2) NUMBER OF SCHOLARS TO EACH

	Certificated Teacher.	Assistant Teacher.	Pupil Teacher.
Voluntary Schools .	87½	713	63½
Board Schools . . .	89½	499½	51

For the numbers on which these averages are calculated, see Table No. 1, Part ii., Statistics of Elementary Schools, Parliamentary Paper (C. 143).

fications of their staff, offer an education to the manual labour class so superior to that which has hitherto been given in any elementary schools, as to render certain the extinction of voluntary schools, or, which is generally equivalent, their absorption into the system of Board schools. This result was not the intention of the Education Act 1870, nor of the Code of that year, and if there were in any district any serious apprehension of such an intention, it may be expected that the ratepayers would interfere with an administration which would be in contrast with that intelligent and prudent management which has almost universally distinguished the School Boards. A panic might occasion such a resistance to the growth of the charge on the rates, as would cause the election of School Boards, whose members would have a mission to restrain expenditure without much regard to the efficiency of schools. Thus a too eager and sanguine interpretation of the duties of a School Board might cause the substitution of cheap and inefficient for good schools. If such a catastrophe be avoided, the School Boards may, by a prudent and progressive administration, become the means of gradually raising the standard of elementary education, while they fulfil their primary function of planting efficient schools wherever they are wanted.

Already the signs of a coming resistance to the growth of school expenditure have arisen in the district of the London School Board, which has distinguished itself by singular devotion to its duties, by great energy, courage, and enterprise, and in its final conclusions by discretion. This Board has had to grapple with a gigantic task. Its outlay has accordingly been vast. The very zeal with which it has encountered every difficulty seems sometimes to have inflamed the imagination of some of its members with too sanguine schemes. But careful investigation and prolonged discussion have chastened these proposals. After a certain experience, some expensive arrangements have been abandoned. Time has probably suggested that a Board holding so pre-eminent a position ought to make its policy in harmony with national, as well as local arrangements. Whatever is generally impracticable, because beyond the resources of the great majority of Boards, ought to be avoided unless the London School Board should court the unenviable distinction of throwing the entire educational machinery of England out of gear. A Board guided by an insight into its wider national responsibilities, will certainly find a sound practical level of action. Nevertheless, some account of the features of its administration, which have created transient alarm, may not be undesirable as a warning.

The estimated outlay of the London School Board for the year to be ended on the 25th of May, 1877, is £398,867 7s. 1d., the items



of which outlay are given in a table below.<sup>1</sup> This, if not exceeded by the actual expenditure, would occasion a rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}d.$  in the pound. The Chairman of the Finance Committee explained to the School Board the circumstances which had given rise to an excess of expenditure, beyond the estimate presented to the Board at the close of the preceding year. Among the causes of this excess,<sup>2</sup> "they had calculated that the cost of educating each child would be £1 2s. 9d. per head net, whereas it had actually risen to £1 12s. 1d." "The total estimate per child was £2 1s., but the actual cost had been £2 12s." He explained that the "net increase was ascertained to be 9s. 4d. per child." This result was challenged, upon the chairman's own data, and it was apparently proved that the net increase was 11s. 6d., and that the net cost had been £1 14s. 3d. The School Management Committee, taking into consideration various economical arrangements, "had come to the decision, that £1 8s. per head" net would be a charge on the rates "sufficient to provide for education." By reference to a table appended to this paper, it will be found that in the year ending the 31st August, 1875, the charge on the rates for every child on the average in attendance on the London Board schools was £1 6s.  $8\frac{3}{4}d.$  This is about 6s. per head above the average charge in such schools in the whole of England and Wales. The estimate of the Chairman for the ensuing year exceeds the average in the appendix by 1s.  $3\frac{1}{4}d.$

The Chairman of the Finance Committee, in explanation of the objects on which "the money raised last year had been expended," said, "the number of schools opened and to be opened by 25th of March, 1876, would be 136, to accommodate 114,833 children, and there were in course of erection 43 other schools, including some temporary ones, which would give accommodation for 32,395. The

(1)

	Estimate for year to be ended 25th March, 1876.			Estimate for year to be ended 25th March, 1877.			Increase for year to be ended 25th March, 1877.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
For maintenance of Schools provided by the Board . . . . .	110,787	5	3	181,189	12	0	70,402	6	9
For carrying out the compulsory bye-laws . . . . .	23,433	16	0	24,931	10	0	1,497	14	0
For Industrial Schools . . . . .	19,079	16	0	20,975	0	0	1,895	4	0
For office expenses . . . . .	12,695	10	0	14,645	14	0	1,950	4	0
For legal expenses (general business)	2,000	0	0	3,000	0	0	1,000	0	0
For interest and repayment of loans	61,882	11	1	84,879	15	8	22,997	4	7
	229,878	18	4	329,621	11	8	99,742	13	4
Deficiency in previous years . . .	33,834	13	1	69,245	15	5	35,411	2	4
	263,713	11	5	398,867	7	1	135,153	15	8

(2) *School Board Chronicle*, February 12th, 1876.

capital account, including £150,000 which the Board had asked for, and would shortly receive, would amount to 2,000,000 of money."

The policy of the Board, both as to the amount of school accommodation provided; the sites selected for new schools; the number, qualifications, and salaries of the staff of adult teachers, and the age, training, and remuneration of the Pupil Teachers, has been the subject of lively discussion. The contention has been that this action of the Board ought to be supplementary, and should have no tendency to become aggressive. In every particular in which the outlay has threatened the prosperity or existence of voluntary schools, steady resistance has been made. This resistance has been in part provoked by the eagerness of the Board to make their schools efficient. This zeal for example, according to the Chairman of the Finance Committee, had led them to proportion the number of their teachers to the number of children for whom accommodation was provided, rather than to the average attendance, which the chairman estimated at 75 per cent. of the accommodation.

In the table in the Appendix for 1875, in which the Government grants are given only for the year ending 31st August, 1874, the total rate of income in the London Board schools was £2 0s. 11½*d.* per child in average attendance, and in the voluntary schools £1 13s. 5½*d.* But we are informed, by the Chairman of the Finance Committee, that the total outlay for the year ending 25th March, 1876, was in London Board schools £2 12s. per child.

There is no reason to believe that an aggressive policy has been deliberately adopted by the majority in the London School Board; but this larger expenditure increases the attractions of the Board schools, and creates apprehensions that the feebler voluntary schools will be gradually deserted, and either closed or transferred to the School Board. But if the policy of the Board were, which it is not, deliberately aggressive, the ultimate cost of the extinction or transfer of the voluntary schools would give rise, in the present state of popular feeling as to local burdens, to the election of a Board intrusted with the duty of preventing such a catastrophe as placing on the rates the charge of supporting all existing schools, as well as all future Board schools needed to complete the school supply of the London District.

The population of that School Board district in 1871 was 3,266,987, and according to the rule given in the note to page xiv. of the Education Report for 1874-5 there ought to be about 450,828 children in daily attendance on elementary schools. According to this estimate, and taking into account the great increase of the population of London since 1871, an average school attendance of half a million of children would fail to satisfy the claims of the Department. Now, at the reduced estimate of the School Board,

£1 8s. would be the net cost per scholar to be charged on the rates, if these children were all educated in Board schools. This would cause an annual charge of £700,000 for the maintenance of schools alone. To this would have to be added the current expenses, which are estimated for the year to be ended on the 25th of March, 1877, as £63,552 4s., and also the interest and instalments for the repayment of the present loan of two millions of money as well as of any future loans. There are therefore strong financial reasons to retain the present voluntary schools of London as part of the existing provision of public elementary schools, and I can see no reason to believe that the London School Board has neglected this consideration of the interests of the ratepayers.

The accommodation provided on the 31st of August, 1875, in London voluntary and Board schools was for 359,770 children, of which provision 103,757 was in Board schools.<sup>1</sup> From the statement of the Vice-Chairman, further accommodation in Board schools for 43,471<sup>2</sup> children will soon be completed. The entire provision will then be for 403,241 scholars. The zealous and persevering exertions of the London School Board have not succeeded in providing accommodation for more than four-fifths of the children, which, according to the estimate of the Education Department, ought to be at school. But it is desirable to bear in mind that the habit of regular school attendance is not soon formed in children, nor the desire to secure it soon inspired in uneducated parents. Poverty, apathy, ignorance, and vice will present a *vis inertia*, that will resist and exhaust for many years all efforts of persuasion or compulsion. The claims of labour have been adapted to a social system in which the school only partially existed. In order that the school may take its place, and education may assert its claims, amidst all social obstructions, time is a necessary element, and the School Board will do well to bear this in mind in any further efforts which it may make to fill up the estimated deficiency in the school accommodation. Especially it will remember that its mission is to supply deficiencies, and not needlessly to extinguish any existing efficient schools.

It must further be remarked that the schools in which accommodation was provided on the 31st of August, 1875, for 359,770 children, were attended on the average by only 244,389 scholars, so that in round numbers about one-third of the accommodation was not yet used; 115,381 places remained to be filled, and 43,471 more were about to be provided. So that accommodation for 158,852 will be available for the children not, on the average in attendance on school.

(1) See table in Appendix.

(2) The Chairman stated the existing accommodation in 136 Board schools to be for 114,833 children, or 11,076 more than in the table in the Appendix, and that further accommodation for 32,395 children was in progress.

None of these circumstances are lost sight of by the vigilant members of the London School Board, and there is no reason to apprehend that they will be neglected in the further steps of their administration. They may be congratulated on having made a large provision for the school wants of London, and, under the watchful observation of the representatives of the voluntary schools, on having, in the main, rightly interpreted the duties which they had to discharge.

This conviction induces me to advert to some risks of error which have arisen from the too sanguine desire of some able and influential members of the Board to elevate the standard of elementary education. The result sought to be attained is deserving of all praise, but the cost of success has not always been foreseen. That which is most needed for the efficiency of schools is the increase of the number, and the improvement of the qualifications, of teachers. Much may be accomplished, in this last particular, by an increased vigilance over the instruction and training of the pupil teachers. The next step, which has been from the earliest period contemplated, is the gradual introduction of adult assistant teachers instead of pupil teachers, but the appointment of one assistant teacher into each of only two-thirds of the 27,000 schools, estimated by the Education Department to be required, would cause an annual outlay of nearly a million of money.

I have not space to discuss here the question of the organization of some of the large schools of cities in separate class-rooms taught by adult teachers. Clearly that is not a plan applicable to a system of schools, the departments of which are, on the average, attended by only 95 scholars.

Probably these considerations have led the thoughtful members of the London School Board to examine by what arrangements the pupil teachers could be rendered more efficient. It was first proposed by them to raise the age at which pupil teachers are apprenticed to 15 years, and the average stipend from £15 to £36. This plan was on discussion found to be open to this obvious objection, that elementary scholars are drafted from school to labour long before 15, and that children of small tradesmen do not remain at elementary schools in sufficient numbers beyond 13 years of age.

Such objections caused the modification of these proposals by the suggestion that the children should be engaged on probation for at least six months at 14 years of age, being paid at the rate of the average stipends of pupil teachers, and that the selection of the apprentices should be made at the close of this period of trial. The term of apprenticeship would be four years, with an average stipend of £34. The advantages which the schools would derive from the

employment of more highly-instructed and mature pupil teachers would be great, and would quite justify the increased expenditure. But that outlay would create a formidable obstacle. To introduce this system into Board schools, where the charge would be borne by the rates, would have the effect of increasing the attractions of the Board schools at the expense of voluntary schools. If means were provided to meet the change in all schools of large towns, the pupil teachers of such schools would take all the Queen's scholarships, to the exclusion from the training colleges of those not apprenticed in urban schools. It follows that any such improvement ought to be universal.

The average stipend proposed for the probationary period of six months, and for four years' apprenticeship, is £32, or £17 more than that of the Minutes of 1846. This increase for as many pupil teachers as were employed on the 31st December, 1874, would occasion an increased charge of £462,927, and would assume enormous proportions if the estimate of the Education Department (Report, 1874-5, p. xiv.) were realised, *viz.* that an average of 3,250,000 children will be in daily attendance at public elementary schools in England and Wales. Then, if the schools had an average of 120 scholars, 27,000 certificated, at least 54,000 pupil teachers and 27,000 candidates would have to be employed, at an annual cost of £34 each for pupil teachers, or £1,836,000, and for candidates at a cost, for six months, of £202,500. The mode of adopting such improvements, without throwing the whole machinery of education in England and Wales out of gear, has, therefore, to be discovered.

Such being some of the chief features of the voluntary and School Board systems, it is important to inquire to what extent the education which they provide is distributed, and where it is to be found.

From a return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated March 3rd, 1876, it appears that of 14,082 civil parishes, 2,005 were under School Boards. On the 1st of April, 1876, there were about 700 School Boards which had no schools, but existed only to administer the bye-laws, under the compulsory clauses of the Education Act. About 1,300 Boards therefore had schools.

In the 14,082 civil parishes, the further extension of School Boards was prevented by the fact, that those parishes which had not public elementary schools under the Act had sufficient accommodation in efficient voluntary schools conducted independently of inspection and of the public aid.

An approximation only can be made to an estimate of the number of such civil parishes. The number of voluntary school institutions (not departments) in 1875 was 12,150, and the number of Boards

which have schools may be, as we have seen, 1,300. If each of the voluntary institutions and Board schools were always in a separate civil parish, there would remain 632 civil parishes not possessing public elementary schools, but having sufficient accommodation in efficient voluntary schools. This estimate can only be very roughly approximative for two reasons. The civil parishes may often contain more than one voluntary or Board school, or both voluntary and Board schools. Thus there will be more than the supposed residue of 630 civil parishes, not containing public elementary schools, but having efficient voluntary schools. Yet this number is probably not so great as to present any formidable difficulty.

On the other hand, the extent of population which has been brought under the compulsory clauses of the Education Act by the establishment of School Boards is very great, as may be ascertained by reading the note below.<sup>1</sup> In the populous boroughs, it must be remembered, that there is generally a great majority of voluntary schools; and, except in London, there are only a few Board schools.

Those 12,077 civil parishes which have not School Boards may fear that they would gain little advantage, if they did not suffer grievous vexation, by being placed under a School Board. Such a Board, in parishes in which there was no resident proprietor, might represent the illiterate occupiers of small farms.

If the school were under their management, it would be starved into inefficiency, unless the farmers were, as in Scotland, disposed to send their own children to it. Even then, the management would be wanting in intelligence, and liable to be perverted by favouritism.

(1) Total population under Boards:—

ENGLAND.

London . . . . .	3,266,987	
104 Boards in 104 Boroughs . . .	5,308,423	
1,299 Boards in 1,780 Parishes . .	3,218,315	11,793,725

WALES.

15 Boards in 15 Boroughs . . .	185,582	
235 Boards in 360 Parishes . . .	560,520	746,102
		<u>12,539,827</u>

Total population under Bye-laws:—

ENGLAND.

London . . . . .	3,266,987	
92 Boards in 92 Boroughs . . .	5,173,131	
352 Boards in 424 Parishes . . .	1,537,153	9,977,271

WALES.

11 Boards in 11 Boroughs . . .	169,622	
71 Boards in 109 Parishes . . .	320,722	490,344
		<u>10,467,615</u>

In parishes in which one or more proprietors were resident, the School Board would, especially if the proprietors co-operated with the clergymen, generally be elected under their influence, and guided by them. In that case, it would represent the intelligence of the parish, and the school would be efficiently conducted, whether it were a common school or were attended only by children of labourers. Also, in parishes in which chiefly enterprising tenants were the occupiers of large farms, a School Board would be elected which would vote an ample income for an efficient elementary school.

By these circumstances the further progress of the School Board system in rural parishes will be determined. A Nonconformist minority would have to depend on the sense of justice of a majority of Church members of the Board, just as they now have to claim the faithful working of the Time Table Conscience Clause from the managers of a Church of England school in receipt of annual grants. It is therefore probable that the administration of the compulsory clauses of the Education Act will be confided, in such rural parishes, to some other authority than a School Board, and that the Government will depend more on the Education Department than on the School Boards, for the efficiency of the rural schools.

The independent voluntary schools, which have hitherto shrunk from inspection, and declined the aid of public grants, are chiefly now to be found in the small civil parishes. In the new Code ampler power is given to promote the efficiency of such small rural schools by the formation of groups to be placed under the superintendence of an organizing master, by whose example in teaching, skill in method, and in the arrangement of classes, as well as by his personal instruction, the standard of attainments in the schools of sparsely-peopled or neglected districts may be raised. This plan has been for some years successfully conducted at the suggestion and expense of a lady of well-known beneficence.

I have avoided, as much as possible, reference to political and religious questions which are the subjects of controversy, but it may be consistent with this abstention that I should remark how much the apprehensions of the religious communions as to the administration of School Boards must have been allayed by the fact, that the communions are fairly represented on the Boards, and that the Cowper-Temple clause has greatly facilitated the almost universal introduction into Board schools of moral and religious instruction by Biblical reading and explanation.

It is impossible in this paper to touch more than the fringe of the questions affecting the position of the forty training colleges of England and Wales. They were built at a cost of £445,977, of which £308,010 was subscribed by the religious communions which founded them. Yet, though the colleges were capable of housing

and educating nearly 3,000 students in 1870, it was to be regretted that, owing to the consequences of some years' previous administration, they had only 2,097 resident students in that year. This number was increased in 1874 to 2,982, an improvement which indicated a growth of confidence in the administration, and of the expectation that the impulse given by the Education Act to the building both of Voluntary and of Board schools could not fail to make the career of an elementary teacher more remunerative and honourable.

I cannot here find space to advert to the collateral questions of the pupil teachers' training, the selection of Queen's scholars, the curriculum of the colleges, nor to the estimation in which is held the certificate granted after two years' training in college, and two other years of probation in charge of an elementary school. All these incidents of the teacher's career have been improved by successive ameliorations of the Code since 1869, or by better administration.

The trained teachers are in harmony, not only with the schools of the religious communions, but also with the majority of Board schools in which religious and moral instruction are given with Biblical sanctions and illustration.

The Education Department are of opinion that the forty training colleges are capable of supplying the waste of teachers in 25,000 schools.

Some of the preceding results of the Education Act and Code of 1870 may be summarised as follows:—

1. The legislation introduced by Lord Ripon and Mr. Forster in 1870 was distinguished by its recognition of the prolonged exertions and sacrifices of the religious communions, and of the progressive administration of the Education Department, as well as by the enterprise and sagacity with which, avoiding the subversion of what existed, it provided for the completion of the fabric of national education.

2. The Public Elementary Schools of England and Wales, on the 31st August, 1875,<sup>1</sup> comprised 17,323 departments of voluntary schools, each taught by a separate head teacher, and containing accommodation, at eight square feet, for 2,760,024 scholars; and also 1,922 similar departments of Board schools with like accommodation for 386,400 scholars.

3. The voluntary schools were, in the year ended 31st August, 1875, daily attended, on the average, by 1,609,895 scholars, and the Board schools by 227,285 scholars.<sup>2</sup>

4. In 14,082 civil parishes<sup>3</sup> there were 2,005 School Boards; and

(1) Table No. 1, Part II., Statistics of Education Department for 1875-6.

(2) Table No. 1, Part II., Statistics of Education Department for 1875-6.

(3) Parliamentary return ordered, March 3, 1876.



on the 31st August, 1875, there were 1,136 Board schools (institutions), which number has certainly increased since that time. There were also 12,150 voluntary schools (institutions) at the same date.<sup>1</sup>

5. There were on the 1st of April, 1876, about 700 School Boards which had no schools under their management.

6. The population under the Bye-laws of the compulsory clauses, administered by 526 School Boards, was on the 1st January, 1876, 10,467,615.<sup>2</sup>

7. The progress of elementary education since 1870 has been great. Towards this the religious communions have contributed 2,785 new departments of schools, of which they have built 1,750 at a total cost of £1,606,298, towards which outlay £318,488 was granted by the Government. The School Boards have contributed 1,922 departments since 1871.

The increase of accommodation since 1870 in voluntary schools was for 880,440 scholars, and in Board schools,<sup>3</sup> for 386,400.

8. The annual income of the voluntary schools has been augmented since 1870 by £614,193 derived from subscriptions, collections, endowments, and school pence, and by £407,352 from public grants. Since 1872, this increase of the annual income of voluntary schools has been £427,020 from subscriptions, &c. The annual income of Board schools, without grants, has since 1872 been increased by £306,746. The increase of annual grants in voluntary schools since 1872 has been £277,786, and in Board schools £75,655.

9. There is no great disparity in the efficiency of the voluntary schools, when compared with the Board schools, as far as can be determined by the percentage of scholars passing the examinations, by the amount of grants earned, and by the number and emoluments of the teachers; but the School Boards have the power to raise the efficiency of their schools by attracting the best teachers, increasing the numbers and qualifications of their staff, and by making the apparatus of instruction in all respects more efficient and attractive than it can soon be made in voluntary schools without the aid of the rates. The adoption of such a policy by School Boards would be aggressive, if rapidly introduced, for the voluntary schools probably could not increase those resources as fast as the Boards. The scholars would therefore be withdrawn from voluntary schools, which would either cease to exist, or would be absorbed into the School Board system.

10. The poverty, ignorance, and apathy of parents, and the frequent migrations of families, greatly interfere with the success of the compulsory clauses, and occasion the continuance of grievous

(1) Table No. 1, as before.

(2) Quarterly List, January 1st, 1876.

(3) Table No. 1, Part II., Statistics of Education Department for 1875-6.

irregularity in school attendance. The claims of industry on the labour of children also limit the daily school time, and prematurely terminate it. These hindrances, together with the hitherto imperfect development of the teaching power in elementary schools, render their present state unsatisfactory.

11. To raise the qualifications of teachers, and to increase the number and efficiency of all the teaching staff, will require a great additional outlay, whatever be the form of organization adopted; but without such improvements, and a considerable growth in the intelligence of parents, and consequently in their sense of the value of education for their children, the best civilising influences of the elementary school cannot be obtained.

12. In proportion as the voluntary schools were extinguished or absorbed, the burden on the local rates would increase. If the tendency to the increase of the rates were rapid and great, apprehension might be entertained of a panic as to local charges, which might cause the present prudent administration of the School Boards to be superseded by one in which economy in expenditure would be sought at the expense of the efficiency of schools.

13. The proper province of the School Boards is to carry out the intentions of the authors of the Education Act and Code 1870. While these Boards supply efficient schools in their districts wherever they are needed, they have also to promote such an improvement in the machinery of instruction, and in the range and standard of elementary education, as may be found practicable, without bringing about the catastrophe of ruin to the voluntary schools.

14. The voluntary schools could not, however, exist as a retarding force. They will have to co-operate successfully, as they have hitherto done, in this endeavour to improve elementary education, and their past exertions and sacrifices, as well as their present position, justify their claim not to be subjected to a deliberately aggressive policy.

JAMES KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH.

## SCHOOLS INSPECTED (LONDON SCHOOL BOARD DISTRICT), YEAR ENDING 31ST AUGUST, 1875.

Denominations.	Annual Grant to Schools (Institutions).	Accommodation, at 8 square feet per child.	Average Attendance.		Present at Inspection.		Presented for Individual Examination.		Government Grants in year ending 31st August, 1875.									
			Day.		Night.		Day.		Night.		Day Schools.			Evening Schools.				
			Day.	Night.	Day.	Night.	Day.	Night.	Amount.	Rate per Child in attendance.	£	s.	d.	Amount.	Rate per Scholar in attendance.	£	s.	d.
Church of England	439	187,772	129,708	1,654	145,833	1,108	64,813	1,140	85,904	5	3	12	11½	656	0	10	7	9½
British, &c.	95	30,990	24,822	286	30,131	575	15,459	270	17,522	2	3	13	6½	153	16	5	10	4½
Roman Catholic	79	28,321	13,255	17	17,036	12	7,658	12	9,589	16	11	12	6½	7	5	6	8	6½
Board Schools	179	108,737	72,544	495	85,935	205	23,145	263	30,779	10	9	10	11½	139	1	5	5	7½
Total	792	338,770	244,389	2,489	278,835	1,760	123,053	1,627	130,792	15	2	12	4	956	10	2	7	8½

## ANNUAL INCOME, AS RETURNED BY MANAGERS OF 752 SCHOOLS.

The returns for 40 Schools were for periods of either more or less than twelve months.

Denominations.	Average attendance in these Schools.	Voluntary Contributions.		School Pence.		Rates.		Government Grants in year ending 31st August, 1874.		Endowments.		Other Sources.		Total.								
		Amount.		Rate per Child.		Amount.		Rate per Child.		Amount.		Rate per Child.		Amount.		Rate per Child.						
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.					
Church of England	126,717	50,140	6 11	7 11	74,914	18 10	11 9½	7 19 3	76,298	19 5	12 0½	7,739	0 8	1 2½	4,592	6 2	0 9	213,813	11 3	1 13 8½		
British, &c.	25,920	8,490	2 6	6 0½	20,770	4 0	16 0½		16,697	6 6	12 10½	3,089	11 5	2 4½	1,787	10 8	1 4½	50,825	15 1	1 19 2½		
Roman Catholic	15,119	9,367	18 1	12 4½	3,831	16 11	5 0½	3 3 0	8,794	16 8	11 7½	186	3 11	0 3	712	19 1	0 11½	22,896	17 8	1 10 3½		
Board Schools	66,772	125	18 11	1	25,037	13 2	7 6	80,261	19 6	1 6 6½	20,911	17 1	6 3	253	4 2	0 1	1,115	16 9	0 4	138,796	9 7	2 0 11½
Total	224,626	68,124	6 5	5 9½	124,574	12 11	10 7½	80,273	1 9	122,612	19 8	10 5½	11,259	0 2	0 11½	8,418	12 8	0 8½	424,263	13 7	1 16 2½	

\* In average attendance.

## SPIRITUALISM AND MATERIALISM.<sup>1</sup>

### II.

“Die theoretischen Irrthümer meist mehr darauf beruhen dass man die Erklärungsgründe aus andern Gebiete der Naturwissenschaften übertragend auf den Organismus anwandte.”—JOHANNES MÜLLER, *Ueber die phantastischen Gesichtserscheinungen*, 1826, p. 3.

### MATERIALISM.

BEFORE proceeding to criticize an hypothesis the very name of which has become a stigma, and which in general terms may be characterized as the reduction of vital and mental phenomena to conditions from which everything extra-organic and metempirical is excluded, it is necessary that I should clearly define the mode of interpretation which I hold to be objectionable, and its relation to the doctrines which I hold to be valid. The doctrine of Organicism, by its rejection of an *extra-organic* agency in the causation of vital and mental phenomena, is decidedly opposed to Spiritualism; but it is little less decidedly opposed to Materialism and Sensualism, as those doctrines are commonly taught and understood; not, indeed, in its attempt to reduce the phenomena to organic conditions, bringing them into harmony with all other physical facts; but in its insistence on the speciality of the conditions, and on the necessity of a synthetic interpretation which will comprise the whole of the factors, past and present, instead of analytically interpreting the product by any one factor, or by a few of the factors. Materialism errs by being at once analytical and abstract in its interpretation of phenomena. It relies on Matter and Force as abstractions, where Organicism sees Matter and Force specially determined under complex and peculiar conditions. Organicism is physiological, and is thus radically opposed to Spiritualism, which is metaphysiological in its fundamental position that vitality and consciousness are in no sense activities of Matter.<sup>2</sup> Organicism is also opposed to Materialism, which is physico-chemical where it should be physiological, mechanical and objective where it should be psychological and subjective.

The grounds of opposition to Materialism and Sensualism will become more apparent as our criticism proceeds. Meanwhile let no reader imagine that I desire to screen myself from the odium wantonly cast upon attempts to interpret Life and Mind by the exhibition of their

(1) Concluded from the *Fortnightly Review* for April.

(2) “All evidence is in favour of the view that exalted function is not dependent either upon complexity of constitution or upon quantity of material. . . . There may be differences of power not dependent upon differences as regards matter and its forces.”—Lionel Beale, *On Life, and on Vital Action in Health and Disease*. Lectures at the College of Physicians, reported in *Lancet*, May 22, 1875.

material conditions, which really means interpreting them in their objective aspect. I think the materialist and sensualist doctrine defective; but the purpose which has animated it, and sustained research in the face of popular prejudice and moral indignation, claims my warmest sympathy. Yet it is in study of the organism that I have learned to separate myself from the materialists and sensualists. Could I but see my way to the reduction of vital phenomena to Physics and Chemistry, or the reduction of all mental phenomena to Sensation, and of Thought to a "property of cerebral cells," no one would more willingly call himself a materialist. The vituperative rhetoric of opponents would not alter my conviction that the doctrine which expressed the observed facts with the greatest precision was the doctrine which carried with it the highest morality.

Let us, therefore, first understand the terms. Materialism is a term having so many applications, and is employed to characterize and stigmatize such various opinions, that a definition is here indispensable. It is sometimes applied to the strictly scientific attempt to explain the objective universe in terms of Matter and Force. It is sometimes limited to the hypothesis of Atomism. In this essay it is limited to the explanation of vital phenomena by physical and chemical laws, without regard to the speciality of organic conditions, and to the explanation of mental phenomena without due regard to the complexity of psychical conditions, vital and social.

Materialism has been profoundly characterized by Comte as the endeavour to explain phenomena of a higher order in the terms of a lower order. This not only points out the defect of Method, it also reveals the secret ground of repulsion which the attempt so generally excites. Materialism is not the reduction of phenomena to material conditions, but of a higher order to a lower order; and is seen equally in the attempts of physicists to reduce Chemistry to Physics, of chemists to reduce Biology to chemical laws, and of biologists to reduce Sociology to biological laws, in disregard of all the special conditions involved in each problem.<sup>1</sup> Every one sees the absurdity of explaining Morals by Mechanics, or Sculpture by Geometry, although mechanical principles are essentially involved in Morals, and geometrical principles in Sculpture; yet this is only a conspicuous illustration of the materialist doctrine.

The objection to Materialism that it wishes to interpret phenomena in terms of Matter and Force, and proceeds on the postulate,

(1) "Un vrai philosophe reconnaît autant le matérialisme dans la tendance du vulgaire des mathématiciens actuel à absorber la géométrie ou la mécanique par le calcul, que dans l'usurpation plus prononcée de la physique par l'ensemble de la mathématique, ou de la chimie par la physique, surtout de la biologie par la chimie, et enfin dans la disposition constante des plus éminents biologistes à concevoir la science sociale comme un simple corollaire ou appendice de la leur."—Comte, *Système de Politique Positive*, t. 61.

"No Force without Matter, no Matter without Force," is an objection which Scientific Method sets aside as idle. Not less idle is the objection that this postulate excludes every idea of Spirit or Force which is not a form of the activity of Matter. The only sense in which the term spiritual can be scientifically employed is that which identifies it with Consciousness, and in that sense the materialist will readily accept it. The great and abiding merit of Materialism, and that which has constituted its progressive effectiveness, in spite of opposition, has been its constant reliance on sensible experience, and its rejection of the idea that phenomena are more intelligible when referred to metempirical agents,—better known when assigned to a mysterious causation than when assigned to the agency of causes known to be operant in simpler cases. By thus denying extra-organic agents, and fixing attention on observable conditions,—by substituting laws (which are ideal expressions of observed facts) in lieu of entities imagined as directing the organism, it has kept within the region of possible Experience, in which even the wildest hypotheses are subject to the control of Verification.

Its defects, however, have been patent. If it has rejected the vague and illusory conception of an unknowable Spirit, or the personification of a logical abstraction (Soul), it has accepted the not less illusory conceptions of a Brain "the organ of the Mind," and of thought "the property of cerebral cells." The spiritualist isolates the Soul from the organism, supposing the organism to be animated by it, played upon by it, formed by it. The materialist unconsciously falls into an analogous error; he isolates, by abstraction, the Brain from the rest of the organism; and supposes mental phenomena to be movements in this Brain. He overlooks the all-important fact, that whatever may be the function of the Brain, that organ is only one in a complex organism, all the parts of which are interdependent, all acting synergetically, so that its functions can no more be isolated from the rest (otherwise than in ideal analysis) than the Soul can be isolated from the body. This seems to me a biological error of widespread reach. By its thorough recognition I was led to the discovery, hereafter to be expounded in detail, that every mental phenomenon is, to speak in mathematical phrase, a function of three variables: sense-work, brain-work, and muscle-work. So far as we can separate any one group of organic phenomena from the whole, this separation is the only one which seems to me scientifically legitimate; by it we are enabled to treat psychical phenomena as the functions of a definite part of the organic mechanism, assigning it to the Neuro-muscular system, as we assign Digestion to the Alimentary Canal, and Locomotion to the limbs. In each case, Analysis fixes attention on a group of organs without overt reference to the others, though with

always an implied reference to their co-operation. The error of Materialism consists not simply in overlooking the artificial nature of such analysis, but in carrying the analysis beyond the special group of organs, and fixing on a single element of the group. An example or two will make this clear.

In 1834, the chemist Couerbe<sup>1</sup> announced his discovery of four fatty substances in the brain, all four containing phosphorus. This was a chemical fact, upon which he preposterously grounded the conclusions that phosphorus was the "principe excitant du cerveau," and that the want of phosphorus reduced the brain of man to that of a brute; excess causing madness, defect idiocy, and a due proportion "giving rise to the sublimest ideas and producing that admirable harmony which spiritualists name the soul"! (p. 191.) Other chemists have since found phosphorus in various forms; and the schools have resounded with the battle-cry of "No thought without phosphorus!"

Surely every synthetic biologist will share the repulsion of the spiritualists against such a mode of interpreting phenomena? We need not dwell on the initial difficulty of ascertaining the precise state in which phosphorus exists in the living brain, since to separate it from its combinations there, by means of oxidation, is to render dubious whether the phosphoric acid thus separated is, or is not, the issue of the oxidizing process; nor need we dwell on the fact that there is still more phosphorus in the bones than in the brain; it is enough that the singling out of one element from a highly complex group is itself a misleading artifice; and that if one element is to be thus assigned the predominance, it should not be phosphorus, of which there is only a trace, but water, which forms 80 per cent. of brain-substance.

Not quite so extravagant, but still very unphilosophical, is the common explanation of Memory, to be read in so many modern treatises, which says that the brain-cells retain sensible impressions as phosphorescent bodies retain luminous impressions, and as photographic plates retain the effect of light. Allowable as such illustrations are by way of metaphor, to accept them as representing psychical processes, is to adopt Materialism in its most fallacious aspect. The vaguest spiritualist conception is preferable. The pious Charles Bonnet sarcastically, and truly, remarked that "souls are very convenient. They are always ready to perform everything. As we cannot see them, cannot touch them, and know nothing about them, we may confidently attribute to them whatever we please, since it is impossible to demonstrate that they cannot effect what we say. With the idea of a soul is usually attached the idea of a very active substance—one continually active. That is enough.

(1) *Annales de Chimie*, lvi. 164.

to give it ample credit. The difficulties of investigation do all the rest."<sup>1</sup>

But if "souls" are thus convenient subterfuges, they are at least as rational as the modern "central nerve cells," about which great nonsense is uttered, especially by those who only know the cells at second hand. I cannot trust myself to express my estimate of passages such as those given below;<sup>2</sup> and they might easily be multiplied. The notion of a Spirit inhabiting the body, and using the brain as its instrument, does not indeed accord with our scientific habits; but the notion of the cerebral convolutions as the seat of Mind, and of particular cells as ideational, while others are emotional, and others sensational,—nay, the very idea of seeking a single centre for the Mind, seems to me not less flagrantly opposed to biological philosophy, than the search for a single centre of Life. The objections are twofold: Psychologically, it is a mistake to regard Mind as if it were a simple function: it is the abstract expression for many complex functions; physiologically, it is a mistake to regard the Brain as the organ of such an abstraction: it is only one organ of a complex group of organs, the united action of which is indispensable. Each organ of Sense has its particular function; but there is no organ of Sensation: for Sensation is but the abstract expression of all the concrete sensations. And so of Mind.

"The nervous system," Virchow has truly said, "is an apparatus composed of an extremely large number of parts, of relatively equal value, without any discernible central point. The more accurately we make our histological investigations, the more do the elements multiply, and the ultimate composition of the nervous system proves to be disposed on a plan analogous to that followed in other portions of the body. An infinite number of cellular elements manifest themselves side by side, more or less autonomous, and in a great measure independent of one another." And elsewhere: "It may seem very convenient to say that the nervous system constitutes the real unity of the body, inasmuch as there is no other system which enjoys such complete dissemination throughout the organs. But even this wide dissemination, and the numerous connections which exist between the individual parts of the nervous system, are by no means calculated to show it to be the centre of all organic action. We have found in the nervous system definite little cellular elements which

(1) Bonnet, *Palingénésie Philosophique*, 1796, i. 129.

(2) "Un jour viendra peut-être où une analyse plus complète de la substance cérébrale rendra compte des manifestations si merveilleuses de l'entendement. . . . L'eût-être arrivera-t-on à trouver dans un métalloïde ou un métal jusqu'ici inconnu l'agent principal de la vie cérébrale. . . . Transmises par les nerfs de nos sens, c'est la substance grise du cerveau qui les perçoit."—Riche, *De l'Organisme*, 1869, pp. 4, 35, and 7. On reading such passages one must ask, Is not this materialism even more preposterous than the spiritualism it opposes?



serve as centres of motion; but we do not find any single ganglion cell in which all movement originates. Sensations are certainly collected in definite ganglion cells, still among them too we do not find any single cell which can be designated the centre of all sensation; but we meet with a great number of very minute centres." <sup>1</sup>

No anatomical, no physiological unity has been demonstrated, nor is such a centre demonstrable. The unity is in the whole organism. It is not the brain which feels and thinks, it is the man. If Mind may, in a certain large interpretation, be called a function of the organism, as Life may be called the function of the organism; or if, in a more restricted and analytical sense, Mind may be called a function of the Nervous System, and, by a further extension of the artifice, a function of the Brain, there will be no danger so long as a distinct recognition of the artifice is kept before us. But the various materialist hypotheses all disregard this, and endeavour to explain by one factor what is in truth the product of many. It is necessary for the facility of investigation, that we should localise certain mental functions—those, for instance, of vision, hearing, and the other senses, no less than those of perceiving, conceiving, loving, imitating, &c., in the same way that we localise the vital functions of digesting, secreting, moving, &c.; yet we no more suppose that it is the organ of sight which perceives an object, or conceives a symbol, than we suppose it is the stomach which moves the limbs. The hypothesis that perception and conception, emotion and volition are "properties of the cerebral cells"—as gravitation is a property of Matter—is not more rational than the supposition that the products of a railway system are the properties of steam. I am not denying the importance of the cerebral cells, though I think it grossly exaggerated; what I deny is that any one element in an extremely complex group can be scientifically admitted as the cause of a highly complex result. The assignment of Thought to the cerebral cells, is singularly at variance with the universal denial of that property to cells of identical structure in the spinal cord and medulla oblongata. The spiritualist may be consistent in fixing on the brain as the organ of the Mind; but the materialist who regards Thought as an ultimate property of nerve-cells, is flagrantly inconsistent in denying this property to such cells wherever they may be found. Even were the cerebral cells of the same importance in the psychical mechanism, as the mainspring is in the mechanism of a watch, we should still deny that sensation and thought were properties of these cells; as we deny that the indication of time is the property of the steel spring. Mind is not a property, it is not even a simple function. It is the aggregate of all the sensitive phenomena, and can only be interpreted through the

(1) Virchow, "Cellular Pathology," 229, 284.

organic conditions of these phenomena. In the same way Life is not a property, nor a function, but the aggregate of organic properties and functions.

The error here insisted on is the physiological analogue of the psychological error which attempts to interpret all psychical phenomena as transformed sensations; and the equivalent error which interprets all psychical phenomena as manifestations of thought, the activities of the Spirit. The sensualist and the spiritualist equally fall into the mistake of analytical interpretation. Unless the sensualist implies in the term Sensation a great deal more than the reaction of a sensory organ, he cannot stir a step; and if he recognises, as he must, the co-operation of the psychical conditions on which Judgment, Comparison, Attention, Abstraction, &c., depend, and through which the so-called "transformations" are effected, he is thereby thrown upon other organic conditions, over and above those of Sensation. In like manner the spiritualist cannot out of pure Thought deduce Images and Perceptions without the co-operation of Sense; that is to say, his Spirit needs the bodily organism for those very manifestations which he assumes to be the products of Thought.

Analysis and synthesis are the systole and diastole of Science, both indispensable. In the analysis of organic facts some appear as constant, fundamental, others as variable and derivative. We endeavour to classify these; to trace the derivative phenomena from those which underlie them, and to trace the modification of the constant conditions. The physiologist thus points out the differentiations of structure which permit all the various secretions to be performed by organs fundamentally similar, all the motions to be performed by muscular organs, all the sensations by nervous organs. But he also points out that while these classes are thus kept, analytically, distinct by their structural modifications, so that the one cannot be performed by the organ of another, all are, nevertheless, united in the vital synthesis of the organism by their community of structure, and community of vital properties. The psychologist must imitate this procedure.

Von Baer truly says that people are generally eager for some palpable object as a cause, delighted if they can satisfy themselves that Life is a thing, which they may see revealed, like a flash of electricity, or a chemical precipitate.<sup>1</sup> It is this which has given birth to the unphysiological hypotheses of Life as Electricity, Oxidation, &c., which assigns Life to the blood, or to Nerve force. Contrasted with this analytical tendency is the tendency which obliterates necessary distinctions, and identifies the inorganic and organic worlds, thus assigning Life and Consciousness to the ultimate molecules of Matter, instead of to special combinations of Matter.

. (1) Von Baer, *Zur Entwickelungs Geschichte.*

D'Holbach thought it not improbable that the whole universe was endowed with Consciousness—an idea often put forward under pantheistic and mystic forms; and to many it seems a logical necessity to conclude that, since Life is dependent on molecular movement, all the moving universe must be alive. They do not suppose the universe to be a cotton manufactory on similar grounds; yet the phenomena classed as Life are no less special, and dependent on speciality of material conditions, than the phenomena exhibited in a cotton manufactory.

The organicist emphasizes the material unity of organic and inorganic phenomena, while emphasizing the phenomenal diversity which arises from speciality of conditions. He does not, with La Mettrie and the crude materialists, say that man is a machine, and his soul the activity of brain-fibres; for he knows that man is not a machine; and that the brain-fibres, however active, are not a soul. He does not ignore, on the contrary he eagerly seeks out, the mechanical and chemical relations in vital and mental phenomena; but he no more assigns the phenomena to these alone, than he explains a symphony by enumerating the stringed and wind instruments of the orchestra, and the mathematical laws of sound.

In Digestion the mechanical and chemical facts are so obtrusive, that many physiologists have been content with purely mechanical or chemical explanations. The various movements of mastication, trituration, and stomachal rotation, are unquestionably important elements in the digestive process, so that Borelli and the school of intromechanicians were disposed to interpret the function as mechanical. But the impossibility of accounting for Digestion without the aid of the chemical disintegrations and transformations, effected by the alkaline and acid fluids, rectified their precipitate judgment, and showed that the mechanical process was simply preparatory, enabling the chemical process to do its work more effectually. Spallanzani and his successors having shown the action of the salivary, gastric, and intestinal fluids, and proved that even outside the organism these fluids effected the disintegration of the food, there arose the belief that Digestion was a purely chemical process. But this, again, was putting a part for the whole, and confounding the chemical process with the physiological process. Because the disintegration could be effected in the laboratory, it was suffered to usurp the place of the digestion effected in the organism. As Wm. Hunter sarcastically remarked, "To account for digestion some have made the stomach a mill; some would have it to be a stewing-pot; and some a work-trough; yet all the while the stomach was neither a mill, nor a stewing-pot, nor a work-trough, nor anything but a stomach."<sup>1</sup> The physiologist, dealing with an organic phenomenon, and not with a

(1) Hunter, "Introductory Lectures," 1784, p. 95.

mechanical nor with a chemical phenomenon, has to take into account all the conditions implied; and he finds that much more is implied than trituration and disintegration, which are themselves processes dependent on the incitation and regulation of a sensory and motor system. The very secretion of the disintegrating fluids, and the contractions of the muscles, are determined by reflex stimulation, or by the still more remote stimulation of sensory states in the shape of emotion or desire.<sup>1</sup>

How misleading the chemical interpretation of a physiological process will be, is shown by a single example. Knowing that the gastric juice is acid, and that to its acidity are ascribed its digestive properties, the chemist interdicts the employment of alkalis in cases of feeble gastric secretion, because the alkali will neutralise the acid, and thus still more enfeeble the already diminished power of the stomach. The physiologist, however, knowing that an alkali stimulates the stomach into increased activity of secretion, foresees that although this alkali will neutralise a certain amount of the acid, this chemical effect is more than compensated by the physiological effect of increased secretion; and he therefore prescribes a small amount of carbonate of soda to assist digestion.

The organicist applauds every attempt to detect the agency of physical and chemical processes in the complex physiological process; he only protests against the notion that a physiological process can be interpreted without taking in all the organic conditions. In the language of Bichat, he declares that to speak of Physiology as Animal Physics, is not more rational than to speak of Astronomy as the Physiology of the stars.<sup>2</sup> On similar grounds we must protest against the interpretation of mental phenomena by movements in the brain, however important such movements may be as factors in the complex group of biological and sociological conditions. Although personal and selfish impulses are indispensable agencies in Moral Life, the attempt to reduce Moral Life to these impulses alone, without the co-operation of unselfish impersonal impulses, and the mighty influence of social conditions, is the Materialism against which Organicism protests. In a word, Organicism is distinguishable by its consistent carrying out of the hypothesis that the organic phenomena grouped under the terms Life and Mind are activities not of any single element, in or out of the organism, but activities of the whole organism in corre-

(1) One of the means adopted to obtain an abundant supply of saliva for investigation is that of placing a hungry animal in presence of food which he cannot reach. The desire thus excited causes the fluid to pour forth copiously.

(2) Bichat, *Recherches sur la Vie et la Mort*, art. vii. § 1. He also truly says: "On analyse l'urine, la salive, la bile, &c., prises indifféremment sur tel ou tel sujet; et de leur examen résulte la chimie animale: soit; mais ce n'est pas là la chimie physiologique; c'est, si je puis parler ainsi, l'anatomie cadavérique des fluides."

spondence with a physical and a social medium. Just as it is the organism which lives, so is it the organism which moves and feels.

I do not know that any previous writer has rigorously carried out the principles of Organicism to this extent; because the traditional opinions respecting the Mind, and the predominance of the analytical tendency, have kept attention fixed exclusively on the brain, and have localised the abstraction Mind in the brain. But if the upholders of Organicism have not extended to Mind the principles adopted with respect to Life, the stream of tendency in modern psychological research has, I think, all pointed in this direction.

The reader will not misinterpret me, and suppose that any discredit is attempted to be thrown on physiological analysis, and the localisation of special phenomena in special parts of the organism. When I say it is the man, and not the brain that thinks, I by no means suggest that the brain is not the crowning factor essential to the process. Without a Nervous System there could be nothing like what we know as Feeling; without a Brain or supreme nervous centre, there could be little or nothing of that complex grouping of sensitive states, which we know as Emotion, Thought, and Will. But Brain and Nervous System are only parts of a living organism, and their functions are only specialisations of the general properties of that organism; separate the Brain from the vital processes going on throughout the organism, and it is no instrument of Consciousness. The materialist asserts that the Brain feels and thinks, as the Stomach digests, and the Lungs breathe. I answer, Yes: but the Stomach does not digest, the Lungs do not breathe, except when these organs form parts of a living organism. An idea will arrest digestion, a little surplus of carbonic acid will arrest respiration, for the same reason that an arrested secretion will fill the mind with gloom, an excess of carbonic acid will stupefy it, a worm in the intestine will distract it, a plugged artery will obliterate it. The physiological specialisations are not ignored, because they are recognised as stages in the general evolution of the organism.

And this leads me to remark that the doctrine of Evolution is itself a protest against the mechanical interpretations of Materialism, since its primary position is, that every phenomenon of a higher and more complex order, while rising out of the conditions of a preceding order, has its origin in this very differentiation of complexity. Evolution demands not only a correlation of parts, but a differentiation of parts, and a correlation of states—that is to say, the phenomena have historical, no less than mechanical antecedents, each stage being the outcome of all that precoded it. Thus the ovule is not fertilisable until the germinal vesicle has disappeared; the stimulus of a sensory organ does not produce a sensation until the organism has been educated to that reaction, and the general irradiation of the stimulation has become restricted to a definite path.

Instincts which wear a mechanical aspect are nevertheless subordinated to this law of development, and will be suppressed if the regular succession of experiences be interrupted.

Having thus briefly assigned the grounds on which every spiritualist and materialist hypothesis must be rejected, I may resume the considerations already advanced by a final word on the moral attitude so unjustifiably assumed by spiritualists. The two hypotheses are not unlike Toryism and Radicalism in politics. They express one-sided views, and represent Order and Progress. Organicism claims to unite these views by showing that Progress is the development of Order. Meanwhile the Spiritualist and the Tory are strong in so far as each steadfastly opposes inadequate explanations and precipitate changes; the Materialist and the Radical are strong in so far as each, while protesting against prejudice and privilege, insists on actual facts and reasonable inferences. But both Spiritualist and Tory have been too apt to load their protest with a threat, claiming for their own side the monopoly of moral purity. It is high time that Spiritualism should cease its exclusive pretensions to lofty aspirations and ideal aims, and cease to assume that any other hypothesis is false because desolating. The threat is held over our heads that if we do not accept the hypothesis of Spiritualism we shall be understood to deny Conscience, Justice, Love for mankind, we shall regard man as no better than the brute, and banish Poetry—with Morality—from the world. Either we must accept an extra-organic agent of which we can know nothing, or we must deny all that men hold most precious, all those "spiritual influences which dignify existence." So powerful is the effect of this incessant rhetoric that few men have the courage to avow their disbelief in an extra-organic agent; and of those who do avow it, many are provoked into an equally offensive attitude, answering threats with defiant epigrams and noisy paradoxes.

Looked at calmly, it is quite obvious that what are called "spiritual facts," remain undisturbed by any hypothesis called upon to render their genesis intelligible. The fact that men sympathize with men, and suffer when they see others suffer, and desire to alleviate this suffering, will not be changed should inductive evidence lead to the conclusion that this sympathetic disposition is an evolution from personal feelings. The fact that man has moral and intellectual needs will not be changed, should the conclusion be adopted that human nature is a higher development of the simian nature. Man does not cease to be a moral being because his remote ancestors were unmoral. Nor will any hypothesis respecting the soul disturb our certainty respecting the facts expressed in that term,<sup>1</sup> and it is these

(1) "Ob die Seele," says Kant, "eine einfache Substanz sei oder nicht, das kann uns zur Erklärung der Erscheinungen derselben ganz gleichgültig seyn."—*Prolegomena*, § 44.

facts which we have to study and reduce to systematic order. The only question for us is which mode of classifying and interpreting them best enables us to regulate our lives. That question is not to be settled by Rhetoric, nor should its examination be disturbed by threats. To warn men against opinions, not because they are false, but because they are supposed to lead to a reversal of other opinions, is unworthy of a serious mind. The healthy moral spirit of research is that of patiently seeking out the truth, abiding by whatever seems most consistent with all other truth, and accepting even its bitterness when it is most bitter. The unhealthy immoral spirit of research is that which suffers our inclinations to dictate our conclusions, turning the gaze away from whatever threatens to disturb our opinions, and eagerly fastening on any compromise which fosters and flatters our prejudices.

Materialism is to be rejected because its Method is unphysiological, not because it contradicts our aspirations, not because it is "instinctively repudiated." The common reference to Instinct is singularly fallacious. Before any feeling can be admitted as an arbiter in theoretic questions, it must be shown to be directly involved. You may dislike a Jew, and dislike a liar, you may feel instinctive repugnance at the idea of music in a church, or at the idea of incurring debts beyond your means, but no one will pretend that your feeling carries the same justification in each of these cases, although in each it may be equally strong. An instinctive repulsion against Materialism (granting for a moment that there is such an instinct) could only have validity on the supposition that Instinct was the sole regulator of Life and Thought. Now, since the whole stress of moral culture is precisely in the suppression of some instincts, and the regulation of them all, it is quite clear that Instinct is not the rule of Life, and *a fortiori*, not the arbiter in Science.

Looked at closely, this instinctive repulsion appears, for the most part, simply a remnant of the old superstition against "prying into Nature," a superstition which regarded Science as on a par with witchcraft. Materialism (and with it, of course, Organicism) is stigmatized as an "attempt to rob life of its mystery." But why should we not rob life of its mystery—if we can? In pre-scientific days men who propounded explanations of the universe in its natural and supernatural relations were revered as teachers so long as they confined themselves to theological and metaphysical speculations; whereas the men who endeavoured by experiment to ascertain the simpler processes of Nature were reviled as godless infidels. Even in our own day there is a lingering notion that piety demands that we should not too closely approach the mystery of Life, nor profane the holy temple by the introduction of instruments used in the laboratory. It is noticeable that writers who feel outraged by

every attempt to explain moral phenomena by natural laws (which they perversely confound with mechanical laws) are urgent in their desire to have all phenomena ultimately referred to moral laws—that is to say, to explain the least complex facts by the most complex. It seems to them absurd to rise from physiological processes to psychological and sociological processes, through ascending complexities of the conditions; but rational to explain physiological processes by the regulative action of a Soul or Spirit.

The objection to Materialism on the ground of its “mechanical views” is valid in so far as it insists on the fundamental distinctions between an organism and a machine. But it generally means more than this. It understands by “mechanical” the attempt to reduce phenomena to a series of dependent sequences of material positions. This is the generalised idea of mechanism—the subordination of parts to co-ordinated unity of action; and in this sense it is as applicable to an organism as to a steam-engine. But a dim terror at the consequences supposed to follow from considering vital and mental phenomena as dependent on material agencies, is heightened by the connotations of the term mechanism in its applications to machines; and hence “mechanical views” come to represent views which substitute the causation of rigorous sequence determined by the structure and connections of organs, for that spontaneity of action which is proclaimed the characteristic of vitality, and is dear because it seems the only basis of moral responsibility. So far has this repugnance to accept definite and orderly conceptions of causation—in place of the conception of a spontaneity not amenable to law—carried some opponents of mechanical views, that they have resisted the attempts to apply the Law of Association, because the law would render mental phenomena less mysterious. They preferred invoking Instinct, or Fundamental Ideas, as more profound, and more religious.

If, however, we view the organism as a vital mechanism, or a sensitive mechanism, we get rid of the misleading connotations; and at the same time, while admitting all the facts which justify the idea of spontaneity and free-will, interpret them as rigorously dependent on organic causation. I do not pretend to deny that the interpretation is difficult. I only say that the spiritualist interpretation is illusory.

GEORGE HENRY LEWES.



## THE POSTULATES OF ENGLISH POLITICAL ECONOMY.<sup>1</sup>

### II.

IN my last paper I discussed the fundamental principle of English Political Economy, that within the limits of a nation labour migrates from employment to employment, as increased remuneration attracts or decreased remuneration repels it; and now I have to treat the corresponding principle as to capital, that it flows or tends to flow to trades of which the profits are high, that it leaves or tends to leave those in which the profits are low, and that in consequence there is a tendency—a tendency limited and contracted, but still a tendency—to an equality of profits through commerce.

First, this requires such a development of the division of labour as to create what we call "trade," that is to say, a set of persons working for the wants of others, and providing for their own wants by the return-commodities received from those others. But this development has only been gradually acquired by the human race. Captain Cook found some Australian tribes to whom the idea of traffic seemed unknown. They received what was given them readily, but they received it as a present only; they seemed to have no notion of giving anything in lieu of it. The idea of barter—an idea usually so familiar to the lower races of men—appeared never to have dawned on these very low ones. But among races in such a condition there is no change of trades as capital becomes more and more profitable in any one. The very conception comes long after. Every one works for himself at everything; and he always works most at what he likes most for the time; as he changes his desires, so far as he can he changes his labour. Whenever he works he uses the few tools he has, the stone implements, the charred wood, the thongs of hide, and other such things, in the best way he can; a hundred savages are doing so at once, some in one way, some in another, and these are no doubt "shiftings of capital." But there is no computation of profit, as we now reckon profit, on such shiftings. Profit, as we calculate, means that which is over after the capital is replaced. But a savage incapable of traffic does not make this calculation as to his flints and his hides. The idea could not even be explained to him.

Secondly, this comparison requires a medium in which the profits can be calculated, that is, a *money*. Supposing that in the flax trade profits are 5 per cent., and that side by side in the cotton trade they are 15 per cent., capital will nowadays immediately run from one to the other. And it does so because those who are making much

(1) Continued from the *Fortnightly Review* for February.

try to get more capital, and those who are making little—still more those who are losing—do not care to keep as much as they have. But if there is no money to compute in, neither will know what they are making, and therefore the process of migration wants its motive, and will not begin. The first sign of extra profit in a trade—not a conclusive, but a strongly presumptive one—is an extra high price in the article that trade makes or sells; but this test fails altogether when there is no “money” to sell in. And the debit side of the account, the cost of production, is as difficult to calculate when there is no common measure between its items, or between the product, and any of them. Political Economists have indeed an idea of “exchangeable value”—that is, of the number of things which each article will exchange for—and they sometimes suppose a state of barter in which people had this notion, and in which they calculated the profit of a trade by deducting the exchangeable value of the labour and commodities used in its production, from the value of the finished work. But such a state of society never existed in reality. No nation which was not clever enough to invent a money, was ever able to conceive so thin and hard an idea as “exchangeable value.” Even now Mr. Fawcett justly says that it puzzles many people, and sends them away frightened from books on Political Economy. In fact it is an ideal which those used to money-prices have framed to themselves. They see that the price of anything, the money it fetches, is equal to its “purchasing power” over things, and by steadily attending they come to be able to think of this “purchasing power” separately, and to call and reason upon it as exchangeable value. But the idea is very treacherous even to skilled minds, and even nowadays not the tenth part of any population could ever take it in. As for the nations really in a state of barter ever comprehending it, no one can imagine it, for they are mostly unequal to easy arithmetic, and some cannot count five. A most acute traveller thus describes the actual process of bargaining among savage nations as he saw it. “In practice,” Mr. Galton tells us of the Damaras, “whatever they may possess in their language, they certainly use no numeral greater than three. When they wish to express four they take to their fingers, which are to them as formidable instruments of calculation as a sliding-rule is to an English schoolboy. They puzzle very much after five, because no spare hand remains to grasp and secure the fingers that are required for ‘units.’ Yet they seldom lose oxen: the way in which they discover the loss of one is not by the number of the herd being diminished, but by the absence of a face which they know. When bartering is going on each sheep must be paid for separately. Thus suppose two sticks of tobacco to be the rate of exchange for one sheep, it would sorely puzzle a Damara to take two sheep and give

him four sticks. I have done so, and seen a man first put two of the sticks apart, and take a sight over them at one of the sheep he was about to sell. Having satisfied himself that that one was honestly paid for, and finding to his surprise that exactly two sticks remained in hand to settle the account for the other sheep, he would be afflicted with doubts; the transaction seemed too pat to be correct, and he would refer back to the first couple of sticks, and then his mind got hazy and confused, and wandered from one sheep to the other, and he broke off the transaction until two sticks were put into his hand and one sheep driven away, and then the other two sticks given him, and the second sheep driven away." Such a delineation of primitive business speaks for itself, and it is waste of space showing further that an abstraction like "value in exchange" is utterly beyond the reach of the real bartering peoples—that a habit of using money, and of computing in it, are necessary preliminaries to comparisons of profits.

Unquestionably the most primitive community can see if a pursuit utterly fails, or if it immensely succeeds. The earliest men must have been eager in making flint tools, for there are so many of them, and no doubt they did not try to breed cattle where they died. But there was in those days no adjusted comparison between one thing and another; all pursuits which anyhow suited went on then as they do among savages now.

Money, too, is in this matter essential, or all but essential, in another way. It is a form in which capital is held *in suspense* without loss. The transfer of capital from employment to employment is a matter requiring consideration, consideration takes time, and the capital must be somewhere during that time. But most articles are bought at a risk; they lose in the process, and become second-hand; an ordinary person cannot get rid of them without receiving for them less—often much less—than he gave. But money is never "second-hand;" it will always fetch itself, and it loses nothing by keeping. No doubt modern civilisation has invented some other forms of property which are almost as good to hold as money. Some interest-bearing securities, like exchequer bills, are so, and pay an interest besides. But these are the creatures of money, so to say, and based upon it; they presuppose it, and would not be possible without it. A community of pure barter, even if it could reckon and compare profits, would not be able to move capital accurately from one trade to another, for it possesses no commodity which could, without risk of loss that could not be calculated, be held idle during the computation.

The refined means by which the movement is now effected is one of the nicest marvels of our commercial civilisation. The three principal of them are as follows:—First, there is the

whole of the loan fund of the country lying in the hands of bankers and bill-brokers, which moves in an instant towards a trade that is unusually profitable, if only that trade can produce securities which come within banking rules. Supposing the corn trade to become particularly good, there are immediately twice the usual number of corn bills in the bill-brokers' cases; and if the iron trade, then of iron bills. You could almost see the change of capital, if you could look into the bill cases at different times. But what you could not see is the mental skill and knowledge which have made that transfer, and without which it could not have been made safely. Probably it would be new to many people if stated plainly; but a very great many of the strongest heads in England spend their minds on little else than on thinking whether other people will pay their debts. The life of Lombard Street bill-brokers is almost exclusively so spent. Mr. Chapman, one of the partners in Overend, Gurney, and Co., once rather amused a parliamentary committee by speaking with unction and enthusiasm of "paper of the very finest quality," by which he meant paper on which the best promises were written. Bills of exchange are only undertakings to pay money, and the most likely to be paid are, in the market phrase, of the "finest quality," and the less likely of inferior quality. The mind of a man like Mr. Chapman, if it could be looked into, would be found to be a graduating machine marking in an instant the rises and falls of pecuniary likelihood. Each banker in his own neighbourhood is the same; he is a kind of "solvency-meter," and lives by estimating rightly the "responsibility of parties," as he would call it. And the only reason why the London bill-broker has to do it on a greater scale is that, being in the great centre, he receives the surplus savings not of one district but of many, which find no means of employment there. He is thus become the greatest and most just measurer of moneyed means and moneyed probity which the world has ever seen;—to reduce it to its lowest terms, he knows that more people will pay more debts than any one who now is, or ever before was, in the world. And the combined aggregate of these persons is a prepared machine ready to carry capital in any direction. The moment any set of traders want capital, the best of them, those whose promises are well known to be good, get it in a minute, because it is lying ready in the hands of those who know, and who live by knowing, that they are fit to have it.

Secondly, in modern England, there is a great speculative fund, which is always ready to go into anything which promises high profits. The largest part of this is composed of the savings of men of business. When, as in 1871, the profits of many trades suddenly become much greater than usual, the Stock Exchange instantly becomes animated; there is at once a market for all kinds of securities,

so long as they promise much, either by great interest or by rise of prices. Men of business who are used to a high percentage of profit in their own trade despise 3 or 4 per cent., and think that they ought to have much more. In consequence there is no money so often lost as theirs; there is an idea that it is the country clergyman and the ignorant widow who mostly lose by bad loans and bad companies. And no doubt they often do lose. But I believe that it is oftener still men of business, of slight education and of active temperament, who have made money rapidly, and who fancy that the skill and knowledge of a special trade which have enabled them to do so, will also enable them to judge of risks, and measure contingencies out of that trade; whereas, in fact, there are no persons more incompetent, for they think they know everything, they really know almost nothing out of their little business, and by habit and nature they are eager to be doing. So much of their money as comes to London is in greater jeopardy almost than any other money. But there is a great deal which never comes there, and which those who make it are able to put out in pushing their own trade and in extending allied trades. The very defects which make the trader so bad a judge of other things make him an excellent judge of these, and he is ready and daring, and most quick to make use of what he knows. Each trade in modern commerce is surrounded by subsidiary and kindred trades, which familiarise the imagination with it, and make its state known; as soon, therefore, as the conspicuous dealers in that trade are known to be doing particularly well, the people in the surrounding trades say, "Why should not we do as well too?" and they embark their capital in it—sometimes, of course, wrongly, but upon the whole wisely and beneficially. In an animated business world like ours, these inroads into the trades with largest gains by the nearest parts of the speculative fund are incessant, and are a main means of equalising profits.

Lastly, there is the obvious tendency of young men starting in business to go into the best-paying business, or what is thought to be so at that time. This, in the best cases, also acts mainly on the allied and analogous trades. Little good, for the most part, comes of persons who have been brought up on one side of the business world going quite to the other side—of farmers' sons going to cotton-spinning, or of lacemakers' sons going into shipping. Each sort of trade has a tradition of its own, which is never written, probably could not be written, which can only be learned in fragments, and which is best taken in in early life, before the mind is shaped and the ideas fixed. From all surrounding trades there is an incessant movement of young men with new money into very profitable trades, which steadily tends to reduce that profitableness to the common average.

I am more careful than might seem necessary to describe the

entire process of equalisation at length, because it is only by so doing that we can see how complex it is, and how much development in society it requires ; but as yet the description is not complete, or nearly so. We have only got as far as the influx of money into new trades, but this is but a small part of what is necessary. Trades do not live by money alone ; money by itself will not make anything. What, then, do we mean when we speak of " capital " as flowing from employment to employment ?

Some writers speak as if the only thing which transfers of capital effect is a change in the sort of labour that is set in motion ; and no doubt this is so far true, that all new employments of capital do require new labour. Human labour is the primitive moving force, and you must have more of it if you want more things done ; but the description, though true, is most incomplete, as the most obvious facts in the matter prove. When new capital comes into cotton-spinning, this means not only that new money is applied to paying cotton operatives, but also that new money is applied to buying new spinning machines ; these spinning machines are made by other machines, as well as labour ; and the second lot of machines again by a third set, as well as other labour. In the present state of the world, nothing is made by brute labour ; everything is made by aids to labour ; and when capital goes from trade to trade, it settles not only which sort of labour shall be employed, but which sort of existing machines should be first used up, which sort of new ones made, and how soon those new ones shall be worn out, not only in the selected trade, but in an endless series subsidiary to it.

To understand the matter fully, we must have a distinct view of what on this occasion and on this matter we mean by " capital." The necessity of a science like Political Economy is that it must borrow its words from common life, and therefore from a source where they are not used accurately, and cannot be used accurately. When we come to reason strictly on the subjects to which they relate, we must always look somewhat precisely to their meaning ; and the worst is that it will not do, if you are writing for the mass of men, even of educated men, to use words always in the same sense. Common words are so few, that if you tie them down to one meaning they are not enough for your purpose ; they do their work in common life because they are in a state of incessant slight variation, meaning one thing in one discussion and another a little different in the next. If we were really to write an invariable nomenclature in a science where we have so much to say of so many things as we have in Political Economy, we must invent new terms, like the writers on other sciences. Mr. De Morgan said (in defence of some fresh-coined substantive), " Mathematics must not want words because Cicero did not know the differential calculus." But a writer on Political Economy is bound—not perhaps by Cicero—but by his readers. He

must not use words out of his own head, which they never heard of; they will not read him if he does. The best way, as we cannot do this, is to give up uniform uses—to write more as we do in common life, where the context is a sort of unexpressed “interpretation clause,” showing in what sense words are used; only, as in Political Economy we have more difficult things to speak of than in common conversation, we must take more care, give more warning of any change, and at times write out the “interpretation clause” for that page or discussion, lest there should be any mistake. I know that this is difficult and delicate work; and all I have to say in defence of it is that in practice it is safer than the competing plan of inflexible definitions. Any one who tries to express varied meanings on complex things with a scanty vocabulary of fastened senses, will find that his style grows cumbrous without being accurate, that he has to use long periphrases for common thoughts, and that after all he does not come out right, for he is half his time falling back into the senses which fit the case in hand best, and these are sometimes one, now another, and almost always different from his “hard and fast” sense. In such discussions we should learn to vary our definitions as we want, just as we say “let  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$  mean” now this, and now that, in different problems; and this, though they do not always avow it, is really the practice of the clearest and most effective writers.

By capital, then, in this discussion, we mean an aggregate of two unlike sorts of artificial commodities—co-operative things which help labour, and remunerative things which pay for it. The two have this in common, that they are the produce of human labour, but they differ in almost everything else if you judge of them by the visual appearance. Between a loaf of bread and a steam-engine, between a gimlet and a piece of bacon, there looks as if there were really nothing in common, except that man made both. But though the contrast of externalities is so great, the two have a most essential common property which is that which Political Economy fixes upon; the possible effect of both is to augment human wealth. Labourers work because they want bread; their work goes farther if they have good tools; and therefore Economists have a common word for both tools and bread. They are both capital, and other similar things are so too.

And here we come across another of the inevitable verbal difficulties of Political Economy. Taking its words from common life, it finds that at times and for particular discussions it must twist them in a way which common people would never think of. The obvious resemblances which we deal with in life dictate one mode of grouping objects in the mind, and one mode of speaking of them; the latent but more powerful resemblances which science finds would dictate another form of speech and mental grouping. And

then what seems a perverse use of language must be made. Thus, for the present discussion, the acquired skill of a labourer is capital, though no one in common life would call it so. It is a productive thing made by man, as much as any tool; it *is*, in fact, an immaterial tool which the labourer uses just as he does a material one. It is co-operative capital as much as anything can be. And then, again, the most unlikely-looking and luxurious articles are capital if they reward and stimulate labour. Artisans like the best of rabbits, the best bits of meat, green peas and gin; they work to get these; they would stay idle if they were not incited by these, and therefore these are "capital." Political Economy (like most moral sciences) requires not only to change its definitions as it moves from problem to problem, but also for some problems to use definitions which, unless we see the motive, seem most strange; just as in acts of Parliament the necessity of the draftsman makes a very technical use of words necessary if he is to do his work neatly, and the reader will easily be most mistaken and confused if he does not heed the dictionary which such acts contain.

Remembering all this, we see at once that it is principally remunerative capital which is transferable from employment to employment. Some tools and instruments are no doubt used in many trades, especially the complex ones; knives, hammers, twine, and nails can be used, are used in a thousand. The existing stock of these is bodily transferred when capital migrates from an employment. But, in general, as I have said before, the effect of the migration on co-operative capital is to change the speed with which the existing machines are worked out, and the nature of the new machines which are made; the "live skill" of an artisan being treated as a machine. On remunerative capital the effect is simpler. As a rule, much the same commodities reward labour in different trades, and if one trade declines and another rises, the only effect is to change the labourer who gets those commodities; or, if the change be from a trade which employs little skilled labour to one which employs much, then the costly commodities which skilled labour wants will be in demand, more of them will be made, and there will be an increase of animation in all the ancillary trades which help their making.

We see also more distinctly than before what we mean by an "employment." We mean a group of persons with fitting tools and of fitting skill paid by the things they like. I purposely speak of "tools" to include all machines, even the greatest, for I want to fix attention on the fact that everything depends on the effort of man, on the primary fruit of human labour. Without this to start with, all else is useless. And I use it out of brevity to include such things as coal and materials, which for any other



purpose no one would call so, but which are plainly the same for what we have now to do with.

And "employment" in any large trade implies an "employer." The capitalist is the motive power in modern production, in the "great commerce." He settles what goods shall be made, and what not; what brought to market, and what not. He is the general of the army; he fixes on the plan of operations, organizes its means, and superintends its execution. If he does this well, the business succeeds and continues; if he does it ill, the business fails and ceases. Everything depends on the correctness of the unseen decisions, on the secret sagacity of the determining mind. And I am careful to dwell on this, though it is so obvious, and though no man of business would think it worth mentioning, because books forget it,—because the writers of books are not familiar with it. They are taken with the conspicuousness of the working classes; they hear them say, it is we who made Birmingham, we who made Manchester, but you might as well say that it was the "compositors" who made the *Times* newspaper. No doubt the craftsmen were necessary to both, but of themselves they were insufficient to either. The printers do not settle what is to be printed; the writers even do not settle what is to be written. It is the editor who settles everything. He creates the *Times* from day to day; on his power of hitting the public fancy its prosperity and power rest; everything depends on his daily bringing to the public exactly what the public wants to buy; the rest of Printing-House Square,—all the steam-presses, all the type, all the staff, clever as so many of them are,—are but implements which he moves. In the very same way the capitalist edits the "business;" it is he who settles what commodities to offer to the public; how and when to offer them, and all the rest of what is material. This monarchical structure of money business increases as society goes on, just as the corresponding structure of war business does, and from the same causes. In primitive times a battle depends as much on the prowess of the best fighting men, of some Hector or some Achilles, as on the good science of the general. But nowadays it is a man at the far end of a telegraph wire—a Count Moltke, with his head over some papers,—who sees that the proper persons are slain, and who secures the victory. So in commerce. The primitive weavers are separate men with looms apiece, the primitive weapon-makers separate men with flints apiece; there is no organized action, no planning, contriving, or foreseeing in either trade, except on the smallest scale; but now the whole is an affair of money and management; of a thinking man in a dark office, computing the prices of guns or worsteds. No doubt in some simple trades these essential calculations can be verified by several persons—by a Board of Directors, or something like

it. But these trades, as the sagacity of Adam Smith predicted, and as painful experience now shows, are very few; the moment there comes anything difficult or complicated, the Board "does not see its way," and then, except it is protected by a monopoly, or something akin to monopoly, the individual capitalist beats it out of the field. But the details of this are not to my present purpose. The sole point now material is that the transference of capital from employment to employment involves the pre-existence of employment, and this pre-existence involves that of "employers:" of a set of persons—one or many, though usually one—who can effect the transfer of that capital from employment to employment, and can manage it when it arrives at the employment to which it is taken.

And this management implies knowledge. In all cases successful production implies the power of adapting means to ends, of making what you want as you want it. But after the division of labour has arisen, it implies much more than this; it then requires, too, that the producer should know the wants of the consumer, a man whom he mostly has never seen, whose name probably he does not know, very likely even speaking another language, living according to other habits, and having scarcely any point of intimate relation to the producer, except a liking for what he produces. And if a person who does not see is to suit another who is not seen, he must have much head-knowledge, an acquired learning in strange wants as well as of the mode of making things to meet them. A person possessing that knowledge is necessary to the process of transferring capital, for he alone can use it when the time comes, and if he is at the critical instant not to be found, the change fails, and the transfer is a loss and not a gain.

This description of the process by which capital is transferred and of what we mean by it, may seem long, but it will enable us to be much shorter in showing the conditions which that transfer implies. First it presupposes the existence of transferable labour, and I showed before how rare transferable labour is in the world, and how very peculiar are its prerequisites. You cannot have it unless you have a strong government, which will keep peace in the delicate line on which people are moving. You must not have fixed castes in inherited occupations, which at first are ways and means to do without a strong government, but which often last on after it begins; you must not have a local army which roots men to fixed spots for military purposes, and therefore very much to fixed pursuits; and you must not have slavery, for this is an imperfect substitute for free transferable labour, which effectually prevents the existence of it. Complete freedom of capital presupposes complete freedom of labour, and can only be attained when and where this exists.

No doubt capital begins to move much before the movement of labour is perfect. The first great start of it commences with a very unpopular person, who is almost always spoken evil of when his name is mentioned, but in whom those who know the great things of which he has been the forerunner, will always take a great interest. It is the money-lender in a primitive community, whose capital is first transferred readily from occupation to occupation. Suppose a new crop, say cotton, becomes suddenly lucrative, immediately the little proprietors throng to the money-lenders to obtain funds to buy cotton. A new trade is begun by his help, which could not have been begun without him. If cotton ceases to be a good crop, he ceases to lend to grow it, his spare capital either remains idle or goes to some other loan, perhaps to help some other crop which has taken the place of cotton in profitableness. There is no more useful trade in early civilisation, though there is none which has such a bad name, and not unnaturally, for there is none which then produces more evil as well as good. Securities for loans such as we have them in developed commerce are rarely to be met with in early times; the land—the best security as we think it—is then mostly held upon conditions which prevent its being made in that way available; there is little movable property of much value, and peasants who work the land have scarcely any of that little; the only thing they can really pledge is their labour—*themselves*. But then when the loan is not paid, “realising the security” is only possible by making the debtor a slave, and as this is very painful, the creditor who makes much use of it is hated. Even when the land can be pledged, peasant proprietors never think that it ought really to be taken if the debt for which it is pledged is not paid. They think that the land is still theirs, no matter how much has been lent them upon it, or how much they have neglected to pay. But odious as the “usurer” thus becomes, he is most useful really, and the beginner of the movement which creates the “great commerce.”

Another prelude to the free transfer of labour—the first prerequisite of the free transfer of capital—is slavery, and within its limits this is free enough; indeed, more free than anything else similar, for you have not to consult the labourer at all, as in all other organizations you must. The capitalist buys the slave and sets him to do, not what the slave likes, but what he himself likes. I can imagine that a theorist would say beforehand that this was the best way of getting things done, though not for the happiness of the doer. It makes the “working group” into an army where the general is absolute, and desertion penal. But so subtle is the nature of things, that actual trial shows this structure of society not to be industrially superior to all others, but to be very ineffectual indeed, and industrially inferior to most of them. The slave will not work except he is made, and therefore he does little; he is no better, or little better, if he

does his work well than if he does it ill, and therefore he rarely cares to do it very well. On a small scale, and under careful supervision, a few slaves carefully trained may be made to do very good work, but on any large scale it is impossible. A gang of slaves can do nothing but what is most simple and easy, and most capable of being looked after. The Southern States of America, for some years before their rebellion, were engaged in trying on the greatest scale and the most ample means the world has ever seen, the experiment how far slavery would go; and the result was short; they never could "make brute force go beyond brute work."

Next, in order that capital can be transferred, it must exist and be at the disposal of persons who wish to transfer it. This is especially evident as to remunerative capital, which we have seen to be the most transferable of all capital. But the earliest wages-paying commodities—the food and the necessities which in simple communities the labourer desires—are accumulated by persons who want them for their own use, and who will not part with them. The "untransferable" labourer—the labourer confined to a single occupation in a primitive society—saves certain things for himself, and needs them for himself, but he has no extra stock. He has no use, indeed, for it. In a society where there is no transferable labour, or need to hire, there is no motive, or almost none, for an accumulation of wages-paying capital which is to buy labour. The idea of it, simple as it seems to us, is one of a much later age, like that in which labour seeking to be hired is the commonest of things, and therefore the commodities needed for hiring it are among the commonest too. The means of buying, and the thing bought, inevitably in such a case as this grow together.

As to the other kind of capital—that which aids labour, the co-operative kind—the scientific study of savage tribes, which is so peculiar a feature of the present world, has brought out its scantiness—I might say its meanness—almost more distinctly than it has brought out anything else. Sir John Lubbock, one of our greatest instructors on this matter, tells us the implements of the Australians are very simple. "They have no knowledge of pottery, and carry water in skins, or in vessels made of bark. They are quite ignorant of warm water, which strikes them with great amazement." Some of them carry "a small bag about the size of a moderate cabbage-net, which is made by laying threads, loop within loop, somewhat in the manner of knitting used by our ladies to make purses. This bag the man carries loose upon his back by a small string, which passes over his head; it generally contains a lump or two of paint and resin, some fish-hooks and lines, a shell or two out of which these hooks are made, a few points of darts, and their usual ornaments, which include the whole worldly treasure of the richest man among them." All travellers say that rude nations have no

*stock* of anything—no materials lying ready to be worked up, no idle tools waiting to be used ; the whole is a “hand to mouth” world. And this is but another way of saying that in such societies there is no capital of this kind to be transferred. We said just now that what we meant by transfer in such a case was a change in the sort of stock—the kind of materials, the kind of machines, the kind of living things to be used fastest, and worn out quickest. But in these poverty-stricken early societies there is substantially no such stock at all. Every petty thing which there exists is already being used for all its petty purposes, and cannot be worked more quickly than it already is, or be worn out more rapidly than it is being worn out.

Next, this capital must be concentrated in “trades,” else it cannot be transferred from trade to trade for the sake of profit, and it must be worked by a single capitalist, or little group of capitalists, as the case may be, else the trade will not yield profit. And this, as has been explained, is not a universal feature of all times, but a special characteristic of somewhat advanced eras. And there must be the knowledge capable of employing that capital—a knowledge which altogether differs in different trades. Nowadays the amount of the difference is a little disguised from us because we see people with “capital” in various pursuits—that is, who are traders in each and all of them. But such persons could not do this unless they were assisted by more specialised persons. The same principle governs political administration. Sir George Lewis, one of the most capable judges of it in our time, has observed —“The permanent officers of a department are the depositaries of its official traditions ; they are generally referred to by the political head of the office for information on questions of official practice, and knowledge of this sort acquired in one department would be useless in another. If, for example, the chief clerk of the criminal department of the Home Office were to be transferred to the Foreign Office, or to the Admiralty, the special experience which he has acquired at the Home Office, and which is in daily requisition for the guidance of the Home Secretary, would be utterly valueless to the Foreign Secretary, or to the First Lord of the Admiralty. . . . Where a general superintendence is required, and assistance can be obtained from subordinates, and where the chief qualifications are judgment, sagacity, and enlightened political opinions, such a change of offices is possible ; but as you descend lower in the official scale, the speciality of functions increases. The duties must be performed in person, with little or no assistance, and there is consequently a necessity for special knowledge and experience. Hence the same person may be successively at the head of the Home Office, the Foreign Office, the Colonial Office, and the Admiralty ; he may be successively President of the Board of Trade, and Chancellor of the Exchequer ; but

to transfer an experienced clerk from one office to another, would be like transferring a skilful naval officer to the army, or appointing a military engineer officer to command a ship of war." And just so in mercantile business—there are certain general principles which are common to all kinds of it, and a person can be of considerable use in more than one kind if he understands these principles, and has the proper sort of mind. But the appearance of this common element is in commerce, as in politics, a sign of magnitude, and primitive commerce is all petty. In early tribes there is nothing but the special man—the clothier, the mason, the weapon-maker. Each craft tried to be, and very much was, a mystery except to those who carried it on. The knowledge required for each was possessed by few, kept secret by those few, and nothing else was of use but this monopolized and often inherited acquirement; there was no "general" business knowledge. The idea of a general art of money-making is very modern; almost everything ancient about it is individual and particular. Distance helped much in this kind of speciality. "To the great fair of Stourbridge," in the south of England, there came, we are told, beside foreign products, "the wool-packs, which then formed the riches of England, and were the envy of outer nations. The Cornish tin-mine sent its produce, stamped with the sign of the rich earl who bought the throne of the German empire, or of the warlike prince who had won his spurs at Grecey, and captured the French king at Poitiers. Thither came also salt from the springs of Worcestershire, as well as that which had been gathered under the summer sun from the salterns of the eastern coasts. Here, too, might be found lead from the mines of Derbyshire, and iron, either raw or manufactured, from the Sussex forges." In an age when locomotion was tedious and costly, the mere distance of the separate seats of industry tended to make separate monopolies of them. Other difficulties of transferring capital were aggravated by the rarity and the localisation of the knowledge necessary for carrying it on.

Next, as we have seen for the attraction of capital from trade to trade, there must be a money in which to calculate such profits, and a good money too. Many media of interchange which have been widely used in the world, and which are quite good enough for many purposes, are quite unfit for this. Cattle, for instance, which were certainly one of the first-used kinds of money, and which have been said to have been that most used, because what we call the primitive ages lasted so long, are quite inadequate. They are good enough for present bargains, but not for the forward and backward-looking calculations of profit and loss. The notation is not distinct enough for accuracy. One cow is not exactly like another; a price list saying that so much raw cotton was worth 20 cows, and so much cotton worth 30 cows, would not tell much for the purpose; you could not be sure what cows you

would have to give or you would get. There might be a "loss by exchange" which would annihilate profit. Until you get good coined money, calculations of profit and loss that could guide capital are impossible.

Next, there must be the means of shifting "money," which we analysed—the loan fund, the speculative fund, and the choice of employment by young capitalists, or some of them. The loan fund on a small scale is, as we have seen, a very early institution; it begins in the primitive village almost as soon as any kind of trade begins at all, and a perception of its enormous value is one of the earliest pieces of true economical speculation. "In the Athenian laws," says Demosthenes, "are many well-devised securities for the protection of the creditor; for commerce proceeds not from the borrowers, but from the lenders, without whom no vessel, no navigator, no traveller could depart from port." Even in these days we could hardly put the value of discounts and trade loans higher. But though the loan fund begins so early in civilisation, and is prized so soon, it grows very slowly; the full development, modern banking, such as we are familiar with in England, stops where the English language ceases to be spoken. The peculiarity of that system is that it utilises all the petty cash of private persons down nearly to the end of the middle class. This is lodged with bankers on running account, and though incessantly changing in distribution, the quantity is nearly fixed on the whole, for most of what one person pays out others almost directly pay in; and therefore it is so much added to the loan fund which bankers have to use, though, as credit is always precarious, they can, of course, only use it with caution. Besides this, English bankers have most of the permanent savings of little persons deposited with them, and so have an unexampled power of ready lending. But ages of diffused confidence are necessary to establish such a system, and peculiar circumstances in the banking history of England, and of Scotland still more, have favoured it. Our insular position exempting us from war, and enabling our free institutions to develop both quietly and effectually, is at the very root of it. But here until within a hundred years there was no such concentration of minute moneys, no such increment to the loan fund, and abroad there is nothing equal to it now. Taking history as a whole, it is a rare and special phenomenon. Mostly the loan fund of a country consists of such parts of its moneyed savings as those who have saved them are able to lend for themselves. As countries advance banking slowly begins, and some persons who are believed to have much are intrusted with the money of others, and become a sort of middlemen to put it out; but almost everywhere the loan fund is very small to our English notions. It is a far less efficient instrument for con-

veying capital from trade to trade everywhere else than here; in very many countries it is only incipient; in some it can hardly be said to exist at all.

The speculative fund, as I have called it, has also but a bounded range of action. The number of persons who have large moneyed savings who are willing to invest them in new things is in England considerable, but in most countries it is small. Such persons fear the unknown; they have a good deal to lose, and they do not wish to lose it. In most communities there is not even the beginning of a settled opinion to tell them which undertaking is likely to be good, and which bad. In the industrial history of most countries, the most marked feature is an extreme monotony; enterprises are few, the same things continue for ages to be done in the same way. The *data* which should guide original minds are few and insufficient; there was not such a thing as a "price list" in any ancient community. No Athenian merchant could, by looking over a file of figures, see which commodities were much lower in their average price, and which therefore might be advantageously bought with money that he could not employ in his usual trade. Even for so simple a speculation as this, according to our present notions, the *data* did not exist, and for more complex ones the knowledge was either altogether wanting or confined to a few persons, none of whom might have the idle capital. The speculative fund does not become a force of first-rate magnitude till we have in the same community a great accumulation of spare capital, and a wide diffusion of sound trade knowledge,—and then it does.

The free choice by young men of the mode in which they will invest the capital which they possess is also in the early times of trade much hindered and cramped, and it only gains anything near the effective influence which it now has with us in quite late times. For a long period of industrial history special associations called "guilds" prohibited it; these kept each trade apart, and prevented capital from going from one to the other. They even kept the trade of city A quite apart from the same trade in city B; they would not let capital or labour flow from one to the other. These restrictive hedges grew up naturally, and there was no great movement to throw them down. They strengthened what was already strong, and that which was weak made no protest. The general ignorance of trade matters in such communities made it seem quite reasonable to keep each trade to those who understood it; other people going into it would, it was imagined, only do it ill, lose their money, and hurt those who did it well by a pernicious competition. We now know that this is a great error, that such guilds did far more harm than good, that only experiment can show where capital will answer in trade, that it is from the outsider that the best improvements com-



monly come. But these things, which are now commonplaces after experience, were paradoxes before it. The first deduction of the uninstructed mind was and is the other way. Nor is it dispelled by mere argument. Civilisation must increase, trade ideas must grow and spread, and idle capital waiting to change must accumulate. Till these things have happened, the free choice by a young man how he will invest his capital is not the common rule, but the rare exception ; it is not what mostly happens, though it may be resisted, but what happens only where it is unusually helped. Even where there is no formal guild, the circumstances which have elsewhere created so many, create an informal monopoly, mostly much stronger than any force which strives to infringe it.

None, therefore, of the three instruments which now convey capital from employment to employment can in early times be relied on for doing so, even when that capital exists, and when some labour at least is available to be employed by it ; neither the loan fund, nor the speculative fund, nor the free choice of a trade by young men, is then a commonly predominant power ; nor do the whole three taken together commonly come to much in comparison with the forces opposed to them.

And even if their intrinsic strength had been far greater than it was, it would often have been successfully impeded by the want of a final condition to the free transfer of capital, of which I have not spoken yet. This is a political condition. We have seen that for the free transfer of labour from employment to employment, a strong government is necessary. The rules regulating the inheritance of trades and the fixed separations of labour were really contrivances to obtain some part of the results of the division of labour, when for want of an effectual government, punishing quarrels and preserving life, free competition and movement in labour were impossible. And this same effectual government is equally necessary, as need not be explained, for the free migration of money. That migration, quite as obviously, needs peace and order, as the migration of labour ; and those who understand the delicacy of the process will need no proof of it. But though a strong government is required, something more is wanted too ; for the movement of capital we need a *fair* government. If capital is to be tempted from trade to trade by the prospect of high profits, it must be allowed to keep those profits when they have been made. But the primitive notion of taxation is that when a government sees much money it should take some of it, and that if it sees more money it should take more of it. Adam Smith laid down, as a fundamental canon, that taxes ought to be levied at the time when, and in the manner in which, it is most easy for the taxpayer to pay them. But the primitive rule is to take them when and how it is most easy to find and seize them. Under govern-

ments with that rule persons who are doing well shrink from showing that they are doing well; those who are making money refuse to enjoy themselves, and will show none of the natural signs of that money, lest the tax-gatherer should appear and should take as much as he likes of it. A socialist speaker once spoke of a "*healthy habit of confiscation*," and that habit has been much diffused over the world. Wherever it exists it is sure exceedingly to impede the movements of capital, and where it abounds to prevent them.

These reasonings give us a conception of a "*pre-economic*" era when the fundamental postulates of Political Economy, of which we have spoken, were not realised, and show us that the beginnings of all wealth were made in that era. Primitive capital accumulated in the hands of men who could neither move it nor themselves—who really never thought of doing either—to whom often either would have seemed monstrous if they could have thought of it, and to whom either was still more often resisted by insuperable difficulties. And this should warn us not to trust the historical retrospect of economists because we see and know that their reasonings on the events and the causes of the present world are right. Early times had different events and different causes. Reasoners like economists, and there are many others like them, are apt to modify the famous saying of Plunket; they turn history not into an old almanac, but into a new one. They make what happens now to have happened always according to the same course of time.

And these reasonings also enable us to explain what is so common in all writing as to those early and pre-economic times. One of the commonest phenomena of primitive trade is "*fixed*" prices, and the natural inquiry of every one who is trained in our Political Economy is, how could these prices be maintained? They seem impossible according to the teaching which he has received, and yet they were maintained for ages; they lasted longer than many things nowadays which we do not reckon short-lived. One explanation is that they were maintained by custom; but this fails at the crisis, for the question is, how could the custom be maintained? The unchanging price could not always be right in changing circumstances. Why did not capital and labour flow into the trades which at the time had more than their "*natural*" price, desert those which had less, and so disturb the first with a plethora, and the second with a scarcity? The answer we now see is that what we have been used to call "*natural*" is not the first but the second nature of men; that there were ages when capital and labour could not migrate, when trade was very much one of monopoly against monopoly. And in such a society fixing a price is a primitive way of doing, what in after ages we do as far as we can; it is a mode of regulating the monopoly—of preventing the incessant dissensions which in all ages arise about what is a

just price, and what is not, when there is no competition to settle that price. The way in which "custom" settles prices, how it gradually arrives at what is right and proper, or at least at what is endurable, one cannot well say; probably many incipient customary prices break down before the one which suits and lasts is stumbled upon. But defects of this rule-of-thumb method are no reproach to primitive times. When we try to regulate monopolies ourselves we have arrived at nothing better. The fares of railways—the fixed prices at which these great monopolies carry passengers—are as accidental, as much the rough results of inconclusive experiments, as any prices can be.

And this long analysis proves so plainly that it would be tedious to show it again, that the free movement of capital from employment to employment within a nation and the consequent strong tendency to an equality of profits there, are ideals daily becoming truer as competition increases and capital grows, that all the hindrances are gradually diminishing, all the incentives enhancing, and all the instruments becoming keener, quicker, and more powerful.

But it is most important to observe that this ideal of English Political Economy is not like most of its ideals, an ultimate one. In fact the "great commerce" has already gone beyond it; we can already distinctly foresee a time when that commerce will have merged it in something larger. English Political Economy, as we know, says that capital fluctuates from trade to trade within a nation, and it adds that capital will not as a rule migrate beyond that nation. "Feelings," says Ricardo, "which I should be sorry to see weakened, induce most men of property to be satisfied with a low rate of profits in their own country, rather than seek a more advantageous employment for their wealth in foreign nations." But these feelings are being weakened every day. A class of cosmopolitan capitalists has grown up which scarcely feels them at all. When Ricardo wrote, trade of the modern magnitude was new: long wars had separated most nations from most others, and especially had isolated England in habit and in feeling. Ricardo framed, and others have continued, a theory of foreign trade in which each nation is bounded by a ring-fence, through which capital cannot pass in or out. But the present state of things is far less simple, and much of that theory must be remodelled. The truth is that the three great instruments for transferring capital within a nation, whose operation we have analysed, have begun to operate on the largest scale between nations. The "loan fund," the first and most powerful of these, does so most strikingly. Whenever the English money market is bare of cash it can at once obtain it by raising the rate of interest. That is to say, it can borrow money to the extent of millions at any moment to meet its occasions; or what

is the same thing, can call in loans of its own. Other nations can do so too, each in proportion to its credit and its wealth—though none so quickly as England, on account of our superiority in these things. A cosmopolitan loan fund exists, which runs everywhere as it is wanted, and as the rate of interest tempts it.

A new commodity, one of the greatest growths of recent times, is used to aid these operations. The "securities" of all well-known countries, their national debts, their railway shares, and so on (a kind of properties peculiar to the last two centuries, and increasing now most rapidly), are dealt in through Europe on every stock exchange. If the rate of interest rises in any one country the price of such securities falls; foreign countries come in and buy them; they are sent abroad and their purchase-money comes here. Such interest-bearing documents are a sort of national "notes of hand" which a country puts out when it is poor, and buys back when it is rich.

The mode in which the indemnity from France to Germany was paid is the most striking instance of this which ever occurred to the world. The sum of £200,000,000 was the largest ever paid by one set of persons to another, upon a single contract, since the system of payments began. Without a great lending apparatus such an operation could not have been effected. The resources of one nation, as nations now are, would not have been equal to it. In fact it was the international loan fund which did the business. "We may say," M. Say states in his official report, "that all the great banking-houses of Europe have concurred in this operation, and it is sufficient to show the extent and the magnitude of it, to say that the number of houses which signed or concurred in the arrangement was fifty-five, and that many of them represented syndicates of bankers, so that the actual number concerned was far more considerable." "The concentration," he adds, "of the effects of all the banks of Europe produced results of an unhopcd-for magnitude. All other business of a similar nature was almost suspended for a time, while the capital of all the private banks, and of all their friends, co-operated in the success of the French loans, and in the transmission of the money lent from country to country. This was a new fact in the economical history of Europe, and we should attach peculiar importance to it." The magnitude of it as a single transaction was indeed very new; but it is only a magnificent instance of what so incessantly happens, and the commonness of similar small transactions, and the amount of them when added together, are even more remarkable, and even more important than the size of this one; and similar operations of the international "loan fund" are going on constantly, though on a far less scale.

We must not, however, fancy that this puts all countries on a

level, as far as capital is concerned, because it can be attracted from one to another. On the contrary, there will always tend to be a fixed difference between two kinds of countries. The old country, where capital accumulates, will always, on an average, have it cheaper than the new country, which has saved little, and can employ any quantity. The Americans in the Mississippi Valley are naturally a borrowing community, and the English at home are naturally lenders. And the rate of interest in the lending country will of course be more than that in the borrowing country. We see approaches — distant approaches even yet, but still distinct approaches—to a time at which all civilised and industrial countries will be able to obtain a proportionate share of the inter-national loan fund, and will differ only in the rate they have to pay for it.

The "speculative fund" is also becoming common to all countries, and it is the English who have here taken the lead, because they have more money, more practical adaptation to circumstances, and more industrial courage than other nations. Some nations, no doubt, have as much or more of one of these singly, but none have as much of the efficiency which is the combined result of all three. The way in which continental railways—the early ones especially, when the idea was novel—were made by English contractors is an example of this. When Mr. Brassey, the greatest of them, was making the line from Turin to Novara, for the Italian Government, Count Cavour sent one morning for his agent, and said, "We are in a difficulty: the public have subscribed for very few shares, but, I am determined to carry out the line, and I want to know if Mr. Brassey will take half the deficiency if the Italian Government will take the other half." Mr. Brassey did so, and thus the railway was made. This is the international speculative fund in action, and the world is filled with its triumphs.

So large, so daring, and indeed often so reckless is this speculative fund, that some persons have imagined that there was nothing which would seem absurd to it. A very little while ago, a scheme—a fraudulent scheme, no doubt—was gravely brought out, for a ship railway over the Isthmus of Panama; the ships were to be lifted upon the line on one side, and lifted off and returned to the ocean on the other. But even the "speculative fund" would not stand that, and the scheme collapsed. But the caricature shows the reality; we may use it to remind ourselves how mobile this sort of money is, and how it runs from country to country like beads of quicksilver.

Young men also now transfer their capital from country to country with a rapidity formerly unknown. In Europe perhaps the Germans are most eminent in so doing. Their better school education, their better-trained habits of learning modern languages, and their readiness to bear the many privations of a residence among foreigners,

have gained them a prominence certainly over the English and the French, perhaps above all other nations. But taking the world as a whole, the English have a vast superiority. They have more capital to transfer, and their language is the language of the great commerce everywhere, and tends to become so more and more. More transactions of the "cosmopolitan speculative fund" are arranged in English, probably, than in all the other languages of the world put together; not only because of the wealth and influence of mere England, though that is not small, but because of the wealth and influence of the other States which speak that language also, the United States, our colonies, and British India, which uses it mostly for its largest trade. The number of English commercial houses all over the world is immense, and of American very many, and yearly a vast number of young Englishmen are sent out to join them. The pay is high, the prospect good, and insular as we are thought to be (and in some respects we are so most mischievously), the emigration of young men with English capital, and to manage English capital, is one of the great instruments of world-wide trade and one of the binding forces of the future.

In this way the same instruments which diffused capital through a nation are gradually diffusing it among nations. And the effect of this will be in the end much to simplify the problems of international trade. But for the present, as is commonly the case with incipient causes whose effect is incomplete, it complicates all it touches. We still have to consider, after the manner Ricardo began, international trade as one between two or more limits which do not interchange their compound capitals, and then to consider how much the conclusions so drawn are modified by new circumstances and new causes. And as even when conceived in Ricardo's comparatively simple manner international trade, as Mr. Mill justly said, and as the readers of his discussion on it well know, is an excessively difficult subject of inquiry, we may expect to find many parts of it very hard indeed to reduce to anything like simplicity when new encumbrances are added. The popular discussion of the subject tends to conceal its difficulties, and indeed is mostly conducted by those who do not see them. Nothing is commoner than to see statements on it put forth as axioms which it would take half a book really to prove or disprove. But with the soundness or unsoundness of such arguments I have at present nothing to do. The object of these papers is not to examine the edifice of our English Political Economy, but to define its basis. Nothing but unreality can come of it till we know when and how far its first assertions are true in matter of fact, and when and how far they are not.

## SOME RECENT TRAVELS.<sup>1</sup>

AFTER reading again the famous travels of Arthur Young in France, in Ireland, and in certain counties in England, it occurred to me to send for half a dozen of the volumes of travel that have appeared in our own book market within the last few weeks. It would have been unfair to expect that any of them would rival the value of Young, because he has become by lapse of time, not only a traveller, but a historian, and not only that, but the historian of an epoch that is of the most special interest to us, and of which he was the last intelligent and impartial eye-witness and recorder. But after reading them, one can hardly help wishing that Arthur Young's method were more commonly imitated. In the true spirit of the eighteenth century, he is social; he studies society, and not scenery nor botany. Then, he goes on horseback and takes time, and does not attempt to traverse too large a field. People now rush round the world in as many months as he allowed for a few provinces of France. It must of course be said first that steam has revolutionised geographical proportions; and next that commerce has made Japan or San Francisco more closely related to England, than a hundred years ago one French province was to another. Still, we feel that there was a serious and very sensible purpose, both in Arthur Young's travelling, and in his writing a book upon it. This can by no means be said either of the expeditions or the books of many of those who have come after him.

Two of the works before us contain accounts of tours round the world, taken solely for purposes of pleasure and mental refreshment. One of them, Mr. Campbell's *Circular Notes*, recalls the tolerant maxim of the elder Pliny, and it was adopted also by Gibbon, 'nullum esse librum tam malum ut non ex aliquâ parte prodesset.' Pliny and Gibbon, however, could hardly have foreseen the incredible efflux of these later days, and there are now too many books of which one must say that not in any part do they profit. Mr. Campbell's *Notes* almost deserve a place in this melancholy and fatal class. Mr. Campbell's style is a striking illustration of the truth that authors are usually the worst enemies of a language, and

- (1) 1. *Over the Sea and Far Away: or Wanderings round the World.* By T. W. Hinchliff, M.A. (Longmans.)
2. *My Circular Notes.* By J. F. Campbell. (Macmillan.)
3. *Notes of an Indian Journey.* By M. E. Grant Duff, M.P. (Macmillan.)
4. *Mandalay to Momiem.* By Dr. Anderson. (Macmillan.)
5. *The Shores of Lake Aral.* By Major Herbert Wood, R.E. (Smith, Elder, & Co.)
6. *Angola and the River Congo.* By Joachim John Monteiro. (Macmillan.)

we may amuse ourselves by imagining the curious impression which such a book would have made upon the critics at the Turk's Head a hundred years ago. The Notes may have given pleasure to the friends to whom they were originally addressed, as they reached home by successive mails, but it is really a serious thing to offer to the public all the flippancies, colloquialisms, and general undress, which are natural and forgivable enough in private correspondence. It is no excuse whatever for the publication of avowedly shallow and inadequate records of travel, that they contain the first fresh impressions of the writer. Unless he happens to be a very remarkable person, with a touch of Montaigne about him, or a Goethean faculty of sowing a leisurely narrative with wise general sentences on art or human fortunes, these bare impressions are worth very little indeed. No doubt, excess of artifice in description, whether it be the artificial exuberance and sentimentality of Chateaubriand, or the artificial dryness and didactics of Volney, is almost as bad as unredeemed triviality and slipshod undress. But the first fault has at least the merit of recognising the sound principle, that whoever prints a book by that fact deliberately invites the public to listen to him, and ought to govern himself accordingly; ought, that is to say, to give them only of his best, instead of thinking that anything which satisfies intimates is therefore good enough to deserve proclamation *ad urbem et orbem*.

Mr. Hinchliff, on the other hand, has been thoroughly successful in giving to his narrative the quality of literature. He has the merits of the author as well as those of the traveller. His book has the charm of fresh personal impressions, and yet it is neither trivial nor flippant; and it tells one a great many interesting things without any of the disagreeable airs of the professor. Mr. Hinchliff is as far removed as possible from those Smelfunguses and Mundunguses whom the author of the *Sentimental Journey* described as setting out with spleen and jaundice, as discolouring and distorting every object they passed, and giving no account of anything but their own miserable feelings. There is a cheerful simplicity and pleasant ease about his description, which makes it delightfully readable. The story runs in an even course without any of those unpleasant jolts from the personal to the general, from tables d'hôte to political economy, from the drawbacks of a bed to the statistics of an empire, which make so many books of travel as uncomfortable as driving along a corduroy road.

The girdle which Mr. Hinchliff put round the earth extended from Southampton to Brazil; through the Straits of Magellan; along the coast of Chili, Peru, and Ecuador to Panama; thence in Mexican waters to San Francisco; from Francisco, after many interesting expeditions in the State of California, to Japan; thence to



Hong Kong, Canton, Singapore, Ceylon, and back again to Southampton, along that track which is becoming as familiar to Englishmen as the road from London to Paris or Tours was a hundred years ago, or the road from Canterbury to Rome five hundred years before that.

When Arthur Young stood in 1767 upon what he calls 'a vast hill near Horndon' in Essex, he declared that nothing could exceed that 'amazing prospect, unless it be that which Hannibal exhibited to his disconsolate troops when he bade them behold the glories of the Italian plain.' We may be sure that he felt as enthusiastic a delight and as full a sense of the sublime and beautiful as if he had gone with Mr. Hinchliff through all the terrors of Cape Pillar and Cape Storm, and all the glories of the Yosemite Valley. The emotions are subjective, and their power is not measurable by the magnitude of their external source and suggestion. But the enormous extension of the field of travel in these days is producing singular results. It helps powerfully in the great process of our time, the indirect transformation in meditative minds of our old presiding conception of the world.

The panorama has a strange effect. Its very animation and variety must tend to make it not only bewildering but depressing to anybody who is accustomed to sum up the forces and aims of the universe in a comfortable moral formula. Optimism was so much easier when men knew less history and less geography. It is only a theory for a small world, and even Pangloss might well have been disconcerted if he could have been supposed to live a century later, and see the world as the modern sees it, with its vast torment of blind and viewless forces. The garment which natural theology has made by way of covering the phenomena of existence begins to strike one as rather a sorry rag, and in spite of the beauty and enjoyment of many of Mr. Hinchliff's scenes, we are more often than not reminded of Mr. Mill's famous indictment against Nature, her racks and wheels, her Noyades more fatal than Carrier's, her plagues surpassing the poison cups of the Borgias. A traveller who goes far afield sees and hears of a thousand correctives to our optimistic eulogies both of nature and of our commercial civilisation. "It is a happy world after all," cried Paley, extolling the benevolent design of creation; "the earth, the air, the water teem with delighted existence!" And there is a modern school, which has repudiated such theological explanations of the universe as satisfied Paley, and yet holds stoutly that nature is justified of her works. It may be so, but as we turn over the pages of travellers on the River Congo, along the Pacific coast of South America, and other districts where daily familiarity has not put the critical intelligence off its guard, we can hardly help feeling

that the orthodox conception of Nature as a goddess of great benevolence and fine taste by no means covers the facts. Moreover such a survey of human activity as is given by an intelligent man who has travelled round the world, suggests many uneasy questions. We find ourselves musing as to the precise superiority of some types of men over brutes; and then again, as to the tremendous compensations that have to be paid for the civilisation of a little fringe of the race. For instance, Mr. Hinchliff saw between Acapulco and Manzanilla a battle between a whale and a thrasher. The thrasher leaps into the air and throws himself on the whale with all his weight and power; while his ally, the sword-fish, assiduously bayonets the whale from beneath. And he tells us of scorpions placed in a tureen, proceeding instantly to furious battle and stinging one another to death in a few instants. These and many other tales of direful spiders, poison oaks, lands rainless and blasted, furnish a suggestive commentary on the theistic enthusiasm which is stirred among blithe people at home on sunny days, and in peaceful moonlight landscapes. And scorpions and poison oaks are not the worst. The earth-spirit in *Faust* professes to be ever weaving at the whizzing loom of time the living robe of godhead, alike in Being's flood and Action's storm. Yet the sum of action is as little godlike as the stream of internecine battle which constitutes the great flow of natural life. Only a few pages beyond the scorpions, the Cathedral and the great square of Lima remind us that ever since the introduction of Christianity by the Spaniards down almost to this very year, men have been torn in pieces by wild horses and done to death in every form of the most barbarous cruelty. Even where there is no enmity and the honour of no church is at stake, what profuse and ruthless using up of human life merely in the way of business! It is computed that in making the railway across the Isthmus of Panama, the mortality among the dense forests was so great that a man died for every sleeper that was laid on the line. On the Gaboon river—for *quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris*?—the poisonous malaria is so deadly to white men that one house of business lost eighty-four clerks in seven years. Mr. Hinchliff, who is as little as possible of a sentimentalist, does no more than refer to the horrible and unhealthy occupation of digging guano in the Chincha islands, and loading the ships; description would have carried him too far. And to what end? An absurd Peruvian army of 15,000 to a population of 2,000,000, and with 2,000 officers; official jobbery and corruption of the worst kind; gambling in the European stock markets; stimulation of avarice in European investors; ultimate distress to bondholders, and impoverishment and ruin to Peru. It was estimated in 1860 that the guano monopoly was producing nearly fifteen million dollars a year. Add this hideous waste of wealth to

the hideous waste of life, and then compute the exorbitant havoc which our want of moral direction is making with the possibilities of the world. It is enough to reduce our glorified ideal of existence to the cynical figure of humanity 'weltering, like an Egyptian pitcher of tamed vipers, each struggling madly to get its head above the others.' As we sing hymns of triumph to progress, to commerce, to the spread of a trading race over the globe, we are deaf and blind to the cost of so much glory, and forget to measure how little it all adds to the moral stature of men. We thrust out from our minds the painful service of the world; those thousands who at our bidding 'speed and post o'er land and ocean without rest,'—on no errand from a beneficent deity, but only that a few more persons may lead lives of idle luxury in South Kensington and Fifth Avenue. Here is a grievous picture of the sorry blessings of commercial civilisation to the barbaric east.

"Junks laden with coal came alongside soon after our arrival, together with a large number of both sexes, who at once began to fill up our huge bunkers with native coal, which appeared little better than dust; and is said to do scarcely fifty per cent. of the work done by good coal. The plan adopted was a new one to me, and the system ominently cruel. Boys and men on one side of the ship, and chiefly women and girls on the other, standing on frail stages raised one above the other, pitch the coals up from hand to hand in baskets holding twelve pounds each, the last one shooting out the contents into a tub which stands upon a weighing-machine on deck. The work began at 8 P.M. and, though many of these poor people were mere boys and girls, they were all—men, women, and children—kept to it without rest for the whole of the night and the next day till 4 P.M. During those twenty hours of continual labour in a smothering coal-dust they were only allowed a few minutes to eat some food for breakfast which was brought off to them from the shore. . . . It was cruel labour for so many hours in the heat of a Nagasaki midsummer; and it made me feel ashamed of the civilisation that could degrade the delicately clean women and pretty girls of Japan to such a picture of dirt and exhaustion as that which they presented at the end of their filthy task."

But, it may be said, the west sends missionaries and a new faith. A page from Mr. Monteiro's interesting book on *Angola and the River Congo* is worth quoting on this matter.

"There can be no doubt that our attempts to civilise the negro by purely missionary efforts have been a signal failure. I will say more: so long as missionary work consists of simply denominational instruction and controversy, as at present, it is mischievous and retarding to the material and mental development and prosperity of Africa. Looking at it from a purely religious point of view, I emphatically deny that a single native has been converted, otherwise than in name or outward appearance, to Christianity or Christian morality. Civilisation on the coast has certainly succeeded in putting a considerable number of blacks into uncomfortable boots and tight and starched clothes, and their women outwardly into grotesque caricatures of Paris

fashions, as any one may witness by spending even only a few hours at Sierra Leone for instance, where he will see the inoffensive native transformed into a miserable strutting bully, insolent to the highest degree, taught to consider himself the equal of the white man, as full as his black skin can hold of overweening conceit, cant, and hypocrisy, without a vice or superstition removed, or a virtue engrafted on his nature."

From Africa go to South America.<sup>1</sup> The Hindoo, who was so deeply hurt at being called a heathen by the Archbishop of Canterbury, may have his religious complacency restored by comparing a page of Mr. Hinchliff's with a page of Mr. Grant Duff's. The first is a scene in Catholic Chili.

"At last we got off at a rattling pace, and though the near horse was dead lame, he was not excused from work on that account. There were some peculiar features in our mode of progression; the driver charged at full speed through several shallow rivers which we had to cross; and, whenever we came to the base of a particularly long or steep hill, he halted the team for a few moments, and then thrashed and larruped them at a gallop till they reached the very top of it, declaring that in no other way would they do it at all. If anybody likes to start a society for prevention of cruelty to animals in South America, he will have a fine field for his operations." (p. 110.)

The second is a dialogue in the dominions of the Maharajah of Bhurtpore.

"Later in the day, I asked another person about the woodland in which the pilu was growing. 'It is,' said he, 'a preserve of the Maharajah's.' 'Does he shoot?' I asked. 'No,' was the reply. 'He thinks it wrong to take life, and never shoots. When he sees cattle over-worked on the road, he buys them and puts them in there to live happily ever afterwards,' holding, apparently, to the good maxim of Ichanger, 'that a monarch should care even for the beasts of the field, and that the very birds of heaven should receive their due at the foot of the throne.'"

There are some other horrible pictures of cruelty to animals in Mr. Hinchliff's pages (p. 54, for instance). On every side we perceive the inadequateness of the old religious doctrine to continue the moral advance of the race; either to raise the dignity of manhood, or to stimulate good feeling for humanity's dumb ministers and helpers. And one reason for this may be illustrated by something that Mr. Hinchliff heard in Mexico.

"He told me that the influence of a degraded and ignorant priesthood was all-powerful for mischief, and the power of giving or withholding absolution was unscrupulously used for the furtherance of any nefarious designs they

(1) It is fair, on the other hand, to refer to Mr. Hunter's testimony. "No impartial observer," he says, "can learn for himself the interior details of any missionary settlement in India (to whatever form of Christianity it belongs), without a feeling of indignation against the tone which some men of letters adopt towards Christian missions."—*Orissa*, ii. 144. See, however, the striking remarks of the bishops themselves on Indian missions, quoted in Mr. Grant Duff's book, pp. 276-8.

might entertain. He knew of one case where a priest who was annoyed by the existence of a Protestant teacher in his neighbourhood, said, in the presence of others, 'There goes a tree that produces no fruit.' The hint was sufficient, and the unlucky heretic was next day attacked, killed, and almost cut to pieces. Since this we have had news from Mexico that at Acapulco a small Protestant community of fifty or sixty persons were attacked during their service by a band of armed men, some of whom walked into the chapel and stabbed the congregation right and left, while others waited outside to murder those who might escape from the interior."

It would be interesting, if we only had space, to mark in these volumes the various illustrations which they are certainly capable of furnishing, of the share that Christianity has had in encouraging the arrogance and cruelty of the more advanced races towards beings whom their exclusive creed has taught them to despise as heathen and unbelievers. So far as England and English empire are concerned, the question how far Christianity is capable of being modified so as to operate in the opposite direction in this respect, is one of the most vital and pressing importance. We now see two phenomena. The narrow and ignorant protestantism of the great middle class in England,—the mercantile and industrial class,—seems to justify a certain holy contempt for the races to whom the Supreme Being did not think fit to send the saving message, and who also seem to have been created obstinately and incorrigibly unable to receive that message even when preached by the fortunate favourites with white skins. Second, though modern religion is strong enough to lend a sort of ratification to arrogance of race, it is not strong enough to supply an effective moral direction, or to curb the lawlessness of the spirit of commercial adventure. The problem is to secure force and will enough in our statesmen, and their executive instruments in India and elsewhere, to resist the pressure that is put upon them by the immoral selfishness of our eastern traders and our chambers of commerce at home.

Dr. Anderson's newly published volume on the two expeditions on the Burmo-Chinese frontier (1868 and 1874) tells the story of the last adventure in which our statesmen seem to have showed their want of this force and will. Lord Salisbury's memorable speech to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, apart from the merits of the question of the Indian import duties on cotton, was of doubtful omen, and the dispatch of the Margary expedition was still worse. Not many months ago the moral of the first or Sladen expedition was pointed in these pages with unanswerable cogency,<sup>1</sup> though perhaps with a slight undesigned harshness towards the leader of the expedition; he was after all no more than the agent of official

(1) "Is our Cause in China Just?" by Dr. Bridges, in the *Fortnightly Review* for November, 1875.

superiors. Dr. Anderson, who accompanied both expeditions, confirms every opinion that has been expressed by the opponents of the policy of the English government in lending itself to the commercial scheme of tapping China on the south-west. To begin with the source of common opinion in Europe about the king of Burmah, with whom we were very nearly at war a few months ago. "European adventurers of various nationalities," says Dr. Anderson, "form an element in the population [of Mandalay, the Burmese capital], small but mischievous; it is hardly to be wondered at if an ill impression of foreigners is formed by the Burmese nobility and gentry, judging from the conduct of some of these foreigners, while again they spread monstrous reports about the king, his social and political habits and ideas, which find their way into the Indian and English press." (p. 17.) He is of opinion (p. 359) that the cordial reception at the capital in 1874, and the readiness of the officials to assist the mission, seemed to prove from the first that the king was sincere in his promise to secure a safe passage through his dominions, and "there has been no reason subsequently to doubt the king of Burma respecting the promises he had made." (See also p. 447.) Then as to the redoubtable Li-sieh-tai, about whom Major Sladen used so much bad language in 1868, this is Dr. Anderson's opinion on his share in the tragedy of last year. "It is impossible," he says, "to avoid the reflection that if the murder of Margary and the attack on our camp had been directed by Li-sieh-tai, he could easily, by direct or indirect means, have disposed of his visitor: and his civility and consideration for his safety, by not allowing him to advance, are surely to be esteemed a strong argument in his favour." (p. 445-6.)

Anyone who will be at the pains to read coolly through Dr. Anderson's narrative, without prepossessions either for or against the opening of a trade route, will only wonder how it could ever enter into the heart of man to conceive a trade route through such a country and such wild and disorganized tribes as he pictures. And it is worth noticing how our own officers increase this disorganization. Even Dr. Anderson himself cannot help remarking, "with all deference to the political branch of our service, that it will be needful in all cases that our residents shall not issue independent summonses and orders to the hill chiefs. The ill-feeling of the Burmese has not unnaturally been excited by British officers dealing, independently of the Woon, with the chiefs, nominally at least subordinate to him as the officer of the king of Burma." (p. 153.)

What is odd is that even Dr. Anderson should wind up his book with the conventional moral, against which every page of it bears evidence, about "establishing in these border lands the right of Englishmen to travel unmolested." "The name of A. R. Margary

will be most fitly honoured by a party of his countrymen formally asserting the right to traverse, in honour and safety, the route between Burma and China," and so forth. Of course every one is sorry for Mr. Margary, whose memory deserves our respect as much as that of anyone else who sacrifices his life in the discharge of official duty. Whether Lord Northbrook or Lord Salisbury was responsible for the expedition itself, it was an expedition of infatuation. It is insufferable nonsense to talk of the right of an Englishman to travel unmolested wherever he may choose to go. Show us that travelling among these wild borderlands and through these disorganized tribes is reason; show it to be common sense and the means of attaining useful ends; but in heaven's name spare us all talk about the right. Even the *Pall Mall Gazette* (Jan. 14) in producing extracts from Mr. Margary's own diary—and most instructive they were—came to the conclusion that it will be more sensible to desist from attempts to force a route over such a frontier and against such inhabitants. As has recently been said, people who attach importance to a trade with South-Western China by way of Rangoon should read Colonel Yule's demonstration how little trade can be expected to flow that way, till the Yangtse and the Canton river change their minds and agree to run into the Bay of Bengal. And Mr. Grant Duff, who has had to consider the question with the conscientiousness, as well as the materials, of a responsible minister, justly warns the public, in connection with these hopes of a Burmo-Chinese trade route, against "the huge delusion that the important markets for our commerce are not the *near* markets, but the distant markets. Half the energy that has been expended in opening markets that are worth very little when you have got them, would, wisely directed, have opened admirable markets at our own doors."

This brings us from the exploratory traveller like Dr. Anderson, and the cheerful idle traveller like Mr. Hinchliff, to what may perhaps without invidiousness be considered a higher type than either. To have had the complete story of Mr. Grant Duff's journey through India would be a most instructive piece of political literature, and it would have been one of the most entertaining books for the educated reader. Mr. Grant Duff is well known as a great master of the art of travel in its highest modern sense. Travel is with him a genuine instrument and auxiliary of culture; not merely an excitable mode of taking exercise or killing time, nor a laborious process of collecting geographical, economical, or statistical information. It is a singular gift, only to be aspired to by a man of many accomplishments and the widest interests, to be able to find the appropriate kind of delight and the right association in all the varied scenes that are famous for natural beauty, or scientific

significance, or their part in human history. Thus in going down the Red Sea, instead of moaning about the heat, like the commonplace tourist, Mr. Grant Duff, knowing that he is passing Jeddah, which is the port of Mecca, reads Nöldeke's life of Mahomet and re-reads Mr. Deutsch's paper on Islam, and recalls Sprenger's sketch. The proximity of these actual scenes of momentous history vivifies books and literary knowledge. This is exactly the kind of preparation which every sensible traveller should insist on making. Mr. Campbell, whose interests are only in the way of physical science, does not think about Mahomet, but finding the great tanks at Aden dry, sets to work to answer the question why the tanks are dry, and why is Arabia a parched waste within a few hours steaming of the recurring rain-floods of the south-west monsoon. The superiority of true culture to mere physical science without culture is illustrated by the fact that Mr. Grant Duff can take just as much interest in astronomical, geological, and botanical matters as Mr. Campbell, and yet rejoice in all the historical and political connections as well. Indeed, some readers have complained that Mr. Grant Duff has given us rather a surfeit of Latinised botany; perhaps this is so, though the circle to whom the Notes were originally addressed may be supposed to have found the botanical jottings interesting enough.

A more earnest complaint is that Mr. Grant Duff omits almost wholly the very matter which would have made his book not only interesting, for it is that already, but really valuable to the English public for a great many years to come. This dry reserve begins with the beginning. Even at Aden, for instance, intricate matters are referred to, and then the veil of discretion is immediately drawn in front of them. Yet when the Prime Minister has asked the constituencies to support the policy of maintaining and strengthening the chain of fortresses between the Thames and the harbour of Bombay, they surely ought to be told something about their fortresses. Is it true that the works of Aden, one of the most important of these fortresses, are to be considered as non-existent in the face of a single great iron-clad? If so, should we have spent some of our four millions more wisely in fortifying Perim than in buying Canal Shares? And there are other questions which, though intricate, could still be made intelligible. These are matters which you cannot prevent journalists from discussing, even if it were desirable that you should prevent them. Then is it not better to give them, and the political part of the public, the best means for discussing them with right knowledge?

It is of course impossible to blame Mr. Grant Duff for failing to report actual conversations on Indian politics with the great public officers who entertained him. Even the disguise of initials would have been too easily penetrated, to prevent such publication from



being an indiscretion of which he is of all men the least capable. The former generation of cultivated travellers committed scandalous sins in this way. An eminent French statesman told us that he once had a narrow escape of Vincennes, because a well-known English lady published in a newspaper a verbatim report of what he had said to her in the course of private conversation. And India is dangerous on a much larger scale than France was under Napoleon III. But what Mr. Grant Duff might have done, nay, what perhaps alike in justice to himself and to his public he ought to have done, was to tell us the various *issues* that he discussed, and the various ideas on each side on which their right solution depends. For instance, he refers in two places to the Salt Customs line (pp. 71, 152), but the reader has no hint of the considerations by which this very important question ought to be judged. And surely, by the way, the statement that the salt tax is as far as possible from being a grievance, might well have been accompanied by the statement that there are Indian authorities of the widest experience, who pronounce the salt tax to be a very heavy grievance indeed.

Mr. Grant Duff enumerates the long list of subjects which he discussed at Calcutta, and then good-humouredly tantalises us with Chamfort's pithy saying: "*Tous les jours j'accrois la liste des choses dont je ne parle plus,*" with its semi-cynical pendent, "*le plus philosophe est celui dont la liste est la plus longue.*" (p. 178.) Now we submit to Mr. Grant Duff that he might have stated the problems involved in some at any rate of these subjects, and the considerations affecting them. It was not at all necessary either to commit himself to a particular solution—which in one who may a year or two hence be again in office would be obviously inexpedient—or to attribute to given Calcutta officials this or that opinion. And of course minor administrative problems are not particularly interesting to the common public. But take such subjects as the Income tax; the aptitude of the natives for the judicial career; our opium revenue; the guaranteed railways; native manufactures. A true and clear exposition of the points of discussion in connection with each of these matters, even without any final conclusion, would have been immensely instructive. As it is, we cannot help feeling that Mr. Grant Duff, whose good sense, coolness, discernment, and trained intelligence, along with the advantages of his position, make him better fitted than any previous traveller to India, has hardly done his best with an occasion for being really and unpretentiously useful to his countrymen at home.

A concluding chapter on India Political and Social does something, it is true, to repair this deficiency. One sentence in it is a key to a trait in the writer which explains the painful injustice with which he has too often been treated in the newspapers. "I have the most

unfeigned distrust," he says, "of my own individual opinion about Indian matters, although I have also the most unfeigned want of respect for the very confident criticisms upon those opinions which I often see or hear delivered by persons who have not taken anything like the same pains to form opinions worth having upon things and people in India." Mr. Grant Duff has the high standard which all men in serious positions ought to have, of the amount of knowledge and reflection which go to constitute a competent opinion, and he suffers because he never dissembles his feelings about those whose standard is only that of brawling ignorance or charlatanry in search of popularity. A man who is openly impatient with people who do not know what they are talking about, is likely to give a good deal of displeasure in such a world as ours. And there is a certain unconscious irony about the man of thorough information dealing with the half informed; the irony is all the more galling because it is at once so simple and so unanswerable. The person who has really studied his question and thought out all its bearings—and Mr. Grant Duff is one of the very few public men who never speak unless they have studied a question—easily becomes obnoxious to those who rush at questions and hope to take the kingdom of heaven by violence. Still, to return to our special case, what is to be said is that India, being ruled by England, is ruled by popular opinion, and therefore it is worth while for men in leading positions not only to take such pains as Mr. Grant Duff takes to reach sound judgments, but to take the same pains in persuading other people to understand and accept them. And the pages on India Political and Social are a valuable contribution in this direction. They abound in careful sense, and their combined moderation and definiteness make them really excellent. Mr. Grant Duff is of opinion that India is a benefit rather than a burden and a risk to England in the following respects: "in that it enlarges our national view of things; in that it affords a market for the products of our industry; in that it sends to us many valuable commodities; and in that it obtains for us increased consideration from other nations." On the other hand, India is a weakness to England; as against France or Russia or Germany we should be much stronger for wanting India. Moreover—

"I think we might have made a better use of our national energy, and genius, and capital; but if I am to understand the question to apply to the future, I should find it hard to give any answer at all. On the one hand, there is every reason to hope that by our rule in India we shall succeed in making that vast country enormously more useful to the world than it is now, or could ever have been under other circumstances. On the other hand, it is impossible to say what results might not have been produced in fields of enterprise more congenial to English habits, in fields of enterprise where our

race could have maintained and multiplied itself. And if it be replied that the prosperity of the colonies is of a much more homely and less glorious kind, I would reply that the colonies are still, even the most forward of them, very undeveloped communities, and that we hardly know how much they might be contributing to the higher work of the world, to its science, its literature, its social and legislative improvement, if a large portion of the ability that has gone to conquer and rule India had gone to them."

Some people are for immediately ridding ourselves of India.

"To that I reply, the thing would be absolutely impossible, however much you might desire it. Think first what conceivable arrangement could be made about the Indian debt, any interference with which would carry discomfort, not to say ruin, into so many British households. What arrangement could be made about the railways, as to which the same remark would apply? What about all the numerous creations of English capital in various parts of the country? How would you compensate all your servants, whose careers would be destroyed by your abandonment of India? How would you pay the pensions of all of those who have served that country under your régime, and whose means of livelihood is largely derived from her revenues? How would you compensate the innumerable traders, who would be so grievously prejudiced by your change of policy, as to have a good right to ask for compensation? No, putting moral and sentimental considerations entirely on one side, we are in for it, and must stick to it. I cannot conceive any one coming to an opposite conclusion, even if he took the gloomiest view possible, and had persuaded himself that Clive and Hastings had simply got their country into the most magnificent scrape recorded in history."

The interesting question—what good is English rule doing in India, Mr. Grant Duff answers in detail. The codes are producing a considerable effect, and in a generation or two their morality is likely to become the morality of India. The incorruptibility of the English magistrate is beginning to extend to the native magistrate, at least in Bengal. The zemindars are learning to have glimpses of the truth that property has its duties as well as its rights. Opinion among educated natives is being broken up in its old moulds, and becoming assimilated to that of Europe. The English language is becoming the *lingua franca* of the peninsula. The idea of the duty of the ruler is becoming entirely transformed among the ruled. "The very people who *think* they prefer native to English rule, would be wild with horror if they were to be exposed for a single year to native rule, as native rule would be if English rule did not subsist side by side with it." Our schools and universities are extending the idea of scientific method. Yet while enumerating all the traits on the fair side of the picture, Mr. Grant Duff is fully alive to the possible sources of peril. He sees that India must have a further hundred years of education before the mass of the people will have climbed many steps of the ladder, and he does not shut

his eyes to the possibility of our disappearance from India under the influence of some catastrophe at present unforeseeable. In what direction the relics of our influence would work, he says, it is vain even to speculate. If the reader will add to this weighty and clear-headed article, the instructive chapter which Mr. Fitzjames Stephen has contributed to a recent work,<sup>1</sup> he will have the materials for a very good theory of English supremacy in India, in the most respectable shape which such a theory can be made to assume.

There is, however, one question which these two able and distinguished men are perhaps not likely to answer; yet it is of vital importance to the comprehension of the true nature of our supremacy. Mr. Grant Duff quotes a passage from Lord Metcalfe containing some of the usual common form about the Power which giveth and taketh away dominion, and asserting that "if we withhold blessings from our subjects from a selfish apprehension of possible danger at a remote period, we shall not deserve to keep our dominions." Now is it not true that a considerable part of the Indian revenue is raised by the production and sale of opium to a nation whose government we violently force to admit it into their dominions?<sup>2</sup> Is it not true that the Chinese rulers, who must have better means of knowing the truth than any one else, protest that this drug is demoralising their people? If this be so, surely any moral theory of our supremacy in India is practically little better than mere cant. Sir George Campbell, in the last number of this Review, dwelt on the precariousness of the opium revenue. "There is not only the danger," he said, "of open war with China, but there is the possibility that China may become strong enough to take her own way in this matter; to say, 'We always have objected to this trade, and we are determined to put a stop to it.' There is the possibility that the conscience of England may be awakened by those who take a strong view of this matter, till the country says, 'We will not force opium on the Chinese; they may do as they like.'" Well, the crust of a seared conscience is a perilous base for an empire. Men like Mr. Grant Duff and Mr. Stephen have the function of helping to carry on the system of government which has been transmitted to us, and which they find to their hands, and of making the best of it in the interests of civilisation. They will hardly descend to the sophism that if we did not supply the opium, some one else would; which is as if the keeper of an infamous house were to defend himself by the *sententia Catonis*, or by the grievous saying of Augustine. They may per-

(1) Chapter viii. of Mr. Hunter's *Life of Lord Mayo*. (Smith, Elder, and Co. 1875.) See especially vol. ii. 175.

(2) A part of this is no doubt a pure export duty. But in the case of Bengal opium, of course, the fact of advances being made to cultivators does not prevent the government of India from being the real manufacturer and seller.

haps reasonably adopt the working principle of public men: *Spartam nactus es, hanc exorna*. They may say: 'The mischief that would arise to humanity from our abandonment of India would be worse than the mischief that arises from our poisoning the Chinese, and depraving international morality by violences misnamed treaties. We acquiesce in some ill that a greater good may come.' Still let us not for a moment forget the vile price at which we maintain work that for the inhabitants of India is beneficent work. To forget this is to lose the great stimulus to Indian statesmen to use their minds by night and day in hitting on some expedient for replacing opium. Above all let us have no superfluity of fine words about it, so long as,—slightly to modify Lord Metcalfe's too high phrases,—we deliberately inflict curses on other people's subjects from a selfish apprehension of possible danger to our own.

Those who are interested in that many-sided Indian question which concerns the Russian advance in the direction of our north-western frontier, will find it worth while to turn over the pages of Major Wood's newly published volume on the Shores of Lake Aral. Major Wood accompanied the Russian geographical expedition to examine the Oxus or Amudarya, and passed several months of the year 1874 in the countries round the Sea of Aral. He takes a view which is less seldom brought before the English public than it ought to be; the view that if a strong government which preserves social order and has put down brigandage, slavery, and man-stealing, is worthy of sympathy, it is impossible not to feel that in undertaking the costly task of introducing civilisation into Turkestan, Russia is fully entitled to our good wishes (p. 183). When merely read in a leading article, these are only words; but Major Wood's account of the strange uncouth life that is led in these barren steppes, and of the modification that has already been introduced, however superficially, in the course of the Russian advance, makes the words real. At the same time, it is no wonder, if in the light of such productions as certain chapters of Colonel Terentief's, of the Turkestan Staff, Englishmen distrust Russian designs.

Major Wood supports the theory that the waters of the Amu may be artificially conducted down the slope of the country by canals of irrigation, and the deserts south of Khiva transformed into productive cotton-fields. Whatever the geographical issues involved in this aspiration may be worth, there are financial and political obstacles that Russia will never overcome. At this moment southern Russia is not prosperous; Odessa is declining; the military expenses of the Empire are already enormous, the occupation of Turkestan itself entailing a heavy loss every year; capital is becoming suspicious of eastern rulers, and

in spite of its honesty hitherto, Russia may one day find herself as ill seen in western money-markets as Turkey or Egypt. Readers who do not exercise themselves in these high matters will be interested by some of Major Wood's very effective landscapes. Here is the silent and mysterious Sea of Aral, the centre of a mysterious region.

"My first view of the great Khwarezmian Lake showed it to possess a special aspect which harmonized, as it were, with its strange historical attributes. A low, far-stretching swamp, covered with vivid verdure, and interspersed with patches of yellow sand and shining azure pools, formed the foreground, where water-fowls were sporting. This separated the river from a waveless green expanse, with limits of deeper tones, which stood out upon a sky of curdled milky blue; while in the middle distance, and cutting the horizon sharply, rose the dark violet mass of Kos Aral, whose steep sides were mirrored perfectly in the clear waters beneath them. Though the sun lit up streaks of fantastic colour, or glanced on snow-white plumage, and though the monotony of the surrounding deserts was for a moment forgotten, solitude remained the pervading spirit of the scene; and when night closed in, this sea without ships and those shores without ports assumed a sadness which was all their own, as a nebulous mist veiled the starlight and spread like a pall over waters whose ripples gave out no gleam of phosphorescence."

Who that has ever read Mr. Arnold's thrice lovely *Sohrab and Rustum*, is not reminded of those admirable closing lines:—

"The majestic river floated on,  
Out of the mist and hum of that low land,  
Into the frosty starlight, and there moved,  
Rejoicing, through the hush'd Chorasmian waste,  
Under the solitary moon;—he flow'd  
Right for the polar star, past Orgunjè,  
Brimming, and bright, and large; then sands begin  
To hem his watery march, and dam his streams  
And split his currents; that for many a league  
The shorn and parcoll'd Oxus strains along  
Through beds of sand and matted rushy isles—  
Oxus, forgetting the bright speed he had  
In his high mountain cradle in Pamere  
A foil'd circuitous wanderer—till at last  
The long'd-for dash of waves is heard, and wide  
His luminous home of waters opens, bright  
And tranquil, from whose floor the new-bathed stars  
Emerge, and shine upon the Aral sea."

EDITOR.

## MADAME DE MAINTENON.<sup>1</sup>

### II.

A PLEASING outline of Madame de Maintenon at the time of her marriage is given by the ladies of St. Cyr. "Her voice was most agreeable and her manner winning, she had a bright and open forehead, a natural gesture of a perfect hand, eyes full of fire, and the carriage of a figure so graceful and supple that it eclipsed the best at court. The first impression she made was imposing, through a veil of severity; but the cloud vanished when she spoke and smiled." Fénelon, a fastidious judge, said she was "Wisdom speaking through the mouth of the Graces," and her arch-enemy, St. Simon, said that she was "grace itself." A striking and attractive presence, no doubt. Her mental endowments have been partly displayed already—a deep, but by no means irritable self-esteem, of vanity not a trace, patience insuperable, a cool and solid judgment, which took the exact measure of persons and things, and saw the situation with precise truth, capable, also, of prompt and vigorous action when required. "I must have mules," she wrote to her brother when about to follow the king in one of his holiday tours among his troops—"I must have mules, cost what they will. Coaches upset, or remain stuck in the roads. Mules always reach their destination." The king should see that one woman at least could be self-helpful and energetic. When Madame de Brinon—the Mother Superior she had placed over St. Cyr—lost her head and became rather noisily insubordinate, a swift *lettre de cachet* transferred her to another convent—a real *coup d'état* which set all Paris wondering. And yet she was placable and incapable of rancour, for all St. Simon may say. The final impression is that of a cold over-prudent nature, of which a wary, long-headed selfishness was the chief spring.

Her correspondence with her brother is a marvel of frigid worldly-wise exhortation. In the hundred and odd of her authentic letters to him, which still exist, it is not too much to say that there is not a generous sentiment to be found. Though genuinely anxious for both his spiritual and temporal welfare, she uses a tone so creeping and mean that we cannot wonder at the small effect of her counsel. The burden of nearly every letter is "live within your income, and think of your salvation." "Good-bye, my dear brother," she writes; "we will feast ourselves at Maintenon (she had just bought the estate) if God spares us. Nevertheless, think of your soul, and be assured that it is ill-advised not to put one's self in the state one would wish to be in at the hour of death." "We shall

(1) Concluded from the *Fortnightly Review* for April.

meet again, if it please God. Think of Him in order to be always ready to die, and for the rest let us keep ourselves jolly." Security as regards income, and security as regards salvation, are the two points which she never leaves out of sight. And she wants no more than security in either case. Though without a tinge of avarice or greed, as her subsequent career showed, she never rested till she had put the good property of Maintenon between herself and poverty. In the same way, with reference to spiritual affairs, though punctilious about her salvation she always treats the matter as a sort of prudent investment, a preparation against a rainy day, which only the thoughtless could neglect. All dark travail of soul, anguish or ecstasy of spirit, were hidden from her. If this moderation proceeded from magnanimity there would be nothing to object, but much to admire. But it proceeded from the opposite pole of moral endowment, from a cautious, confined temper, incapable of self-forgetting ardour in any direction. Her maxim was never to quarrel with anybody, and she stoically adhered to it, under down-treadings which would have caused a worm to turn. "Never boast," she says to her brother; "it is unlucky, and attracts ridicule." These words give the formula as it were from which her practical life was deduced. The meekness with which she carried her honours and supposed paramount influence rather puzzled the vainglorious world in which she moved. "I have seen her," says St. Simon, "yielding her place, and retreating everywhere before titled ladies; polite, affable, as a person who pretends to nothing, who makes a display of nothing, but who imposes much." The scripture which says that he that exalteth himself shall be abased, she had taken thoroughly to heart: mingling therewith a flavour of the old Greek dread of a Nemesis awaiting the proud. Not to seize a high place, but to be invited to it, and again to retreat to a lower seat, flattered her delicate and fastidious self-love. She belongs to the class of "glorieuses modestes," as Ste. Beuve says, with untranslatable felicity. It was this temper which has thrown such a pale grey hue over all her authentic letters. She never seems to write to any one on any thing out of fulness of heart. Almost without exception her letters are letters of business, written with a close practical object. In the fewest words and an Attic style she treats of the matter in hand. But all expansion of spirit or unburdening of heart are suppressed as if they were heresy or treason. One might suppose her letters were written under the impression that somebody was looking over her shoulder as she composed them.

With that perspicacity and talent of seeing things as they were, to which allusion has just been made, she saw this disposition in herself, and thus expressed it:—"My days are now spent in a regular course, and very solitary. I pray to God a moment on getting up. I go to two masses on days of obligation, and to one on other days.



I say my office every day, and I read a chapter of some good book. I say my prayers on going to bed, and when I awake in the night I say a *Laudate* or a *Gloria Patri*. I often think of God in the day-time; I offer him my actions; I beg he will take me from this (the Court), if I cannot save my soul here; *and for the rest, I am not conscious of my sins. I have a morality and good inclinations, which cause me to do scarcely any evil.* I have such a desire to please and to be liked, that I am on guard against my passions; thus I never have to reproach myself with deeds, but with very worldly motives, a great vanity, much levity and dissipation, a great freedom in my thoughts and judgments, and carefulness in speech which is only founded on human prudence. This is about my state. Order the remedy which you think proper."<sup>1</sup> The self-knowledge here shown is remarkable, and the absence of cant admirable. The more singular is the cool self-possession of the passage and utter lack of all spiritual—we will not say fervour, but sensibility. Indeed, Madame de Maintenon's conscience was not easily alarmed, and when she had performed her regulation religious exercises and attended to her exchequer, she faced the future with serene outlook. She had a regrettable facility of seeing only one of these objects of her interest at a time, and the eye which observed her worldly concerns was perhaps more vigilant than its colleague which attended to spiritual matters. The years of contention with Montespan, and the humiliation they involved, already show this.

The gospel word that we cannot serve two masters must have seemed insipid to Madame de Maintenon, or at least it occasionally admitted of exceptions. She had brought the two services into complete agreement, or rather unity, and served Heaven most when she was performing her duties at Court. But even she must have felt that now and again the combination was difficult. One cannot but lament that in 1677, when Madame de Montespan was again in a painfully interesting condition, and knew not where or how to escape from public observation, even as Aphrodite of old poured the obscurity of a welcome nimbus round her favourites, so Madame de Maintenon carried off the abashed, if not contrite, fair to her country house at Maintenon, and screened her for two months at a stretch from the prying gaze of a too curious world.<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to suppose that Christian charity alone operated here. The "terrible scenes" above alluded to had occurred two years before. The two ladies were on the terms fitting to the situation—shortly at daggers drawn. Madame de Maintenon had prayed, and implored others to pray, that she might be saved from the Court and its evil communications,

(1) "Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 96. "Du reste je ne connais pas mes péchés. J'ai une morale et de bonnes inclinations qui font que je ne fais guère de mal."

(2) "A Maintenon ce 7 avril, 1677.—J'ai M. du Maine et Madame de Montespan ici, il y a six semaines." Again: "A Maintenon ce 8 mai, 1677.—J'ai toujours ici Madame de Montespan."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., pp. 329—332.

and then takes the very *corpus delicti* to her own home. Was this for edification, and, if so, who was edified? It was not noble, it was not even consistent. But doubtlessly circumstances were harsh and imperative. Even this excuse cannot be pleaded, not for an action, but for a thought, a suggestion of Madame de Maintenon to her brother. That sorry spendthrift, for once, had a little money, which his sister had procured for him through a job with the farmers of the revenue. She advised him, with her usual partiality for secure income, to lay it out in land in Poitou. "For," she adds with complete coolness, "estates will be given away there in consequence of the emigration of the Protestants." Nothing recorded of Madame de Maintenon gives us so unfavourable an impression of her as this short sentence. She had tasted poverty, and the shudder of it had never left her. She had been a Calvinist, and in a mild degree had suffered for her faith. But the anguish of that dread exodus passing under her eyes touched her not; destitution and exile suffered for conscience sake struck no chord of sympathy within her. The opportunity was favourable for a good investment. It seemed natural to her to seize it.<sup>1</sup>

The amount of influence exercised by Madame de Maintenon after her marriage with the King, has been a subject of much dispute from her own days to ours. Those who had forfeited or failed to win her favour, and who indemnified their overt adulation by secret calumny, ascribed every failure in war or policy to her sinister action. To St. Simon or La Princesse Palatine she is the evil principle of French politics, a mysterious shade gliding about the dark recesses of the Court, touching and perverting everything, but appearing frankly nowhere. Her admirers declared, and still declare, that her influence was powerless except for good. It is not very difficult to understand how these opposite impressions were produced. Madame de Maintenon's influence might easily be at once both very great and very limited; great in the dispensation of favours and promotions—a matter of supreme interest to the courtier world—and limited as to the great lines of policy pursued. The King's habit of working with his ministers in her cabinet, his occasional references to her, with the complimentary query, "What thinks your Solidity on this point?" filled the troop of placehunters with the alarmed conviction that her authority was paramount, and that one had to please her or die. When, again, we find her relating, with her usual proud humility, that her apartment was so full, that it was like a crowded church; that generals, ministers—nay, the King's sons—waited in her ante-chamber till she could receive them; that the circle of ladies around her was so close, that she could hardly breathe, we may take it for granted that all this court

(1) "Vous ne pourriez mieux faire que d'acheter une terre en Poitou; elles vont s'y donner par la désertion des Huguenots."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. ii., p. 208.

was not paid for nothing, and that that astute world knew well what it was about when it took so much trouble. On the other hand, she seems to have been not so much incapable of, as profoundly indifferent to politics, which went nearer to boring her stoical patience than perhaps anything else. She lacked entirely the intellectual audacity and ambition, the fervour and freedom of spirit, which lead to bold political initiative and courageous play for a great stake in that high game. And if she had had such qualities, we may be quite sure she would not have been for long a favourite of Louis XIV.

A less keen eye than hers would have measured the robust stubbornness of the man, his morbid dread of being ruled, and vanity so sensitive that no services, however long or valuable, failed to wound it. She knew the fate of Colbert, of Louvois, and finally of Montespan; and to leave no doubt on the matter, she did make some timid attempts in the way of direct influence, without success. "I did not please in a conversation on the works now going on, and my regret is to have given offence without profit. Another building here will cost a hundred thousand francs. Marly will soon be a second Versailles. There is no help for it but prayer and patience." "The King will allow only his ministers to talk to him about business. He took it ill that the Nuncio addressed himself to me. I should be well content with the life of slavery I lead, if I could do some good. I can only groan over the turn things have taken." These avowals are made to an intimate friend, Cardinal Nôailles, archbishop of Paris, and cannot have been soothing to self-esteem. Then contrast them with this report of an eyewitness: "I have seen her sometimes, when tired, vexed, disquieted, and ill, assume the most smiling air and cheerful tone, amuse the King by a thousand inventions, entertain him alone four hours at a stretch, without repetition, weariness, or scandal. When he left her room at ten at night, and her bed-curtains were being drawn, she would say to me with a sigh, 'I can only tell you that I am worn out.'" And yet it is certain she had influence of no common kind. It is in no wise surprising. The King's partiality for her, which was such that he could not pass a quarter of an hour in a crowded Court without saying something in her ear—their unbroken intimacy and contact for thirty years, must have given opportunities enough, by the right word inserted in the right place, by the well-chosen epithet attached to a name for honour or disgrace, even by eloquent silence, to turn the scale and make or mar the fortunes of soldier or civilian, as the case might be. Thus her reputation is not much served by the distinction just made. After all, the selection of the *personnel* of a government is a highly important point, and it would seem that her action in this regard was on the whole injurious. Her partiality for Villeroy, Chamillart, and Voisin cost France dear, if she had as much to do with their promotion as is alleged. On the other hand, let us honourably acquit

her of the heavy charge of having urged the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the consequent persecutions. As far as she dared, her advice was given the other way, towards a mitigation of the severities exercised against the Huguenots; so much so, that the King said to her, "I fear, madame, that the mildness with which you would wish the Calvinists to be treated arises from some remaining sympathy with your former religion." It is, indeed, to her immense honour that she seems to have been entirely above the usual baseness of renegades, which leads them to atone for their apostasy by calculated animosity and zeal against the communion they have left. The example of Polisson showed her that such baseness was not without reward, but she remains free of all suspicion of it. Indeed, Madame de Maintenon's thoughts and interests were much less absorbed in the court than her enemies have supposed. Her heart was elsewhere—in her toy convent of St. Cyr.

St. Cyr took its origin in the quite laudable and benevolent wish to succour and relieve the daughters of noble houses of broken fortunes. She had been a well-born pauper and orphan, and determined to mitigate to the limit of her power the hard lot in others which she had felt so bitterly herself. She commenced in a humble way first at Rueil, and afterwards at Noisy. Lastly, she persuaded the King to erect the spacious building which still exists at St. Cyr, and endow it with 200,000 francs per annum. The conditions of admittance were poverty and noble birth. The advantages offered were religious and practical education (especially needlework in all its branches was taught with great care), continued till the age of twenty, free of all cost or charge whatsoever; then a dowry on suitable marriage approved by the King, or a preferential nomination to places in religious houses in the gift of the crown, when a vocation to the monastic life seemed manifest. The establishment consisted of two hundred and fifty pupils, governed by a staff of sixty nuns.

For the last thirty years of her life Madame de Maintenon devoted all the time and thought she could save from her occupations at court, to St. Cyr. Whenever she was residing at Versailles, she went at least every other day to her favourite institution, arriving there as early as six in the morning, and not returning till the same hour at night. She visited the classes and offices to see how the mistresses and officers performed their functions, inspected the infirmary, and often attended to and consoled the sick. When she had brought her establishment into something like working order, she persuaded the King to see it. The young ladies and their superiors received him, it need not be said, with all the grave pomp which became such a community. A *Te Deum* was sung, the damsels defiled before him, and each in passing made a profound reverence to his Majesty. Then, according to a tradition preserved at St. Cyr till its suppression, as he was about to enter the garden, a

chorus of three hundred young voices greeted him with a hymn, of which the words were written by Madame de Brinon, the Mother Superior, and the music by Lulli. We seem to have heard the words before, though in another language—

“Grand Dieu, sauvez le Roi !  
 Grand Dieu, vengez le Roi !  
 Vive le Roi !  
 Qu'à jamais glorieux,  
 Louis Victorieux,  
 Voe ses ennemis,  
 Toujours soumis,  
 Grand Dieu,” &c. &c.

And not only the words, but the air, was exactly the same as our “God save the King.” The French claim originality, and declare that Handel, who visited St. Cyr in 1721, stole the tune and took it with him to England. The English retort the charge of plagiarism. But if plagiarism there be, it seems more probable that a roving minstrel like Handel, was able and willing to make the appropriation, than that a sedentary and secluded body like the ladies of St. Cyr should purloin from abroad a chant composed (on that supposition) in honour of a heretical prince—George I.

But soon St. Cyr was the scene of more festive entertainments. Madame de Maintenon thought that a little dramatic declamation might be at once an agreeable distraction and a useful exercise for her young flock. Some pieces of Corneille and Racine were tried, with only too much success. They “contained passions dangerous for youth,” and she wrote to Racine—“Our little girls played yesterday your *Andromaque*, and played it so well that they will play it no more, nor any one of your pieces.” She then asked the author of *Phèdre* if he could not write something especially for St. Cyr, which would be irreproachable on the score of dangerous passions. After some hesitation he complied. The result was *Esther*.

Racine entered into his new occupation with much interest, and even zeal. He chose the most promising girls, and taught them their parts with much assiduity. At last the actresses were ready. Persian robes, trimmed with pearls and diamonds, had been prepared, songs for the choruses composed, a temporary theatre erected on the landing of the great staircase. After one or two rehearsals Madame de Maintenon was satisfied with the effect, and determined to give the King a surprise. He came attended by only a few of the most intimate courtiers and bishops, and was so delighted with the play and spectacle, that when he got back to Versailles he did nothing but talk of *Esther*. The whole court, and even Paris, was forthwith seized with a perfect passion to see the new wonder. Nothing left to renew an amusement in which he found so much pleasure, the king invited a larger circle of lords and ladies. This

play-acting had now become serious business at St. Cyr, and while the teachers, assisted by Racine and Boileau, did their best to produce a result worthy of the occasion, it is not surprising that the "little novices" became, from excessive anxiety to acquit themselves well, not a little alarmed. Many of them, in their nervous fear of a breakdown, flung themselves on their knees before going on the stage, and repeated a fervent "Veni Creator" to compose their spirits. The success was overwhelming. The rage to obtain admittance waxed ever hotter. Not only the usual courtiers, but the most grave bishops, the most learned magistrates, the most busy Ministers of State, struggled eagerly for a privilege which had now become a mark of signal favour. Bossuet went, and Father la Chaise, the King's confessor, and President Lamoignon. Madame de Sévigné could not get admitted till the fourth representation. The grandest display of all was on the 5th of February, 1689, when Louis took his royal guests, James II. and Mary of Modena, to see the play. He showed the exiles over the establishment with imperturbable urbanity, although James "appeared insensible to everything." The greatest order and decorum were observed on all occasions, in spite of the crowds. Madame de Maintenon had a list made out of those who were to be present, and strict orders were given to allow no one to enter whose name did not appear in it. The King was early at his post, and seems to have voluntarily assumed the functions of boxkeeper. "When he arrived, he placed himself at the door inside, and holding up his cane to serve as a barrier, he remained till all those who were invited had entered. Then he caused the door to be shut. He permitted few of his suite to come in, and those who were admitted were ordered to be very silent, and not allowed to say a word to anybody." We may believe that Louis found more real enjoyment in these amusements, procured for him by his half-nun wife, than in the lavish galas and sumptuous ballets and carousals he had formerly given to please Madame de Montespan.

But this bright prospect was soon overcast. The ice once broken, the young performers took to their theatricals with such zest that they threatened to become actresses and nothing else. The applause they had received puffed them up with vanity, and instead of a demure convent Madame de Maintenon found herself at the head of a troop of pert young ladies who thought only of pushing their fortunes at court, and of making good matches. Several did make conquests on the boards. A stringent reform was needed, and at last carried out with a great deal of trouble and anxiety to Madame de Maintenon. She acknowledged that she had been chiefly to blame for introducing a worldly spirit into the community. She was at one moment so disheartened that she was nearly disposed to throw up her undertaking. However, with time and patience she effected a thorough reformation. But this welcome result had hardly been

achieved when a new peril assailed her from the opposite quarter. A morbid mysticism, introduced by the famous Madame Guyon and propagated by Fénelon and Madame de la Maisonfort, filled St. Cyr with a heresy, and gave rise to much alarm in the orthodox world all over France. That annoyance was also subdued, but not until the brilliant author of *Télémaque* had been disgraced by the king and condemned by the pope, and the fascinating but rather hysterical La Maisonfort and two other ladies of St. Cyr had been removed out of harm's way by *lettre de cachet* to a distance. Then at last Madame de Maintenon had her toy convent all to herself. The pleasure she had in going there, in dining with the nuns and their pupils, is mentioned by her biographers and referred to by herself with great unction, as a proof apparently of singular spirituality of mind. "As soon as she saw the towers of her dear Thebais, of that abode of piety which God had given her to restore her strength, she thanked Heaven." "When I hear the door shut behind me on entering that solitude, which I never leave without regret, I feel full of joy." She seems indeed to have spent a good portion of her time there in recounting with questionable humility the fatigues and irritations of her life at court. "Oh, my dear daughters, how happy you are to have left the world, how happy to be occupied with God alone." We must reconcile ourselves to this trait in Madame de Maintenon, to follow her own deepest inclination, and then to entreat pity for the sacrifice it involved. Assuredly she would not have been at court if she had not chosen to be there, and it is not wonderful that years of lassitude with the dreary and pompous etiquette of the court should have rendered the calm and repose of a religious house a welcome and refreshing change.

Madame de Maintenon, and the king also, rested great hopes on St. Cyr as a school of morals and piety, which would in time leaven all France. "There is enough there," she said, "to renew the perfection of christianity in all the kingdom." He grew fonder of the place with advancing years and deepening religious convictions. Often of an afternoon, he would extend his walk to St. Cyr and hear vespers or compline in the convent chapel, after which the husband and wife would return home to Versailles in pensive mood, we may suppose. Louis was very gracious and even respectful to the nuns. If he happened to be in hunting dress he would not enter their holy precincts, but waited for Madame outside. At other times he would take one of the younger pupils on his knee (the age of admittance might be as low as seven), ask her name, and make her repeat her catechism. With the ladies who formed the religious staff, he conversed familiarly about the ordering of their house, and even about public affairs. Somebody spoke of founding another monastery. "There are other things much more urgent than that," said Madame de Maintenon, "to secure peace and relieve the poor people of their

burdens." "Yes," said Louis, "that is what a king should aim at: peace in his kingdom, and relief of his people. But to obtain these advantages for them we are forced against our will to oppress them. We want peace, but a good peace, and I ask it of God continually." "Who alone," added the king, "can change the hearts of those who oppose it," viz. the European coalition. On one of these evenings at St. Cyr, a skilful surprise was prepared for the king. "It was on May 25th, 1704, after a soft spring day, when the garden was in its beauty." Louis XIV. found all the young ladies with flowers in their hair, grouped in bands, dancing and singing. In his walk at each avenue, each bosquet, he met one of these joyous troops, from which children stepped out to recite a dialogue or verses. At last when the sun was about to set behind the wooded hills of St. Cyr, he stopped in the great parterre, whence can be seen the magnificent view of the Val de Gallie, the park of Versailles and the heights of the forest of Marly. The damsels assembled round the ornamental piece of water and sang a canticle, of which the first strophe was—

"Du Seigneur troupes fidèles,  
Anges du ciel, veillez tous,  
Veillez, couvrez de vos ailes,  
Un roi qui veille sur nous."<sup>1</sup>

An idyllic scene, no doubt, but rather marred by an element which seems to come from the Opéra Comique. Indeed, to enjoy it fully, we have need to forget the condition of France at the time.

Three ruinous wars, and a system more ruinous still of collecting the revenue which supported them, had brought France to the verge of exhaustion. The population had greatly decreased all over the country—large towns, like Tours and Troyes, having lost two-thirds and three-fourths of their inhabitants. Commerce had declined in a similar ratio. The silk manufacture at Lyons had fallen since the prosperous days of Colbert from eighteen thousand to four thousand looms. The fisheries of Normandy and other trades had decayed largely. Not only the persecuted Huguenots, but other capitalists had emigrated, so insupportable was the onslaught of the great army of tax collectors let loose on the country by the farmers of the revenue. To the tillers of the soil, the worst lot, as ever, was reserved. They had already reached the *savage* state, subsequently described by the Marquis de Mirabeau, the Friend of Man, in the following century. "You may see troops of them," says the intendant of Bourges, "seated in a circle in the middle of a ploughed field, and always at a distance from the highways. If you approach, they disperse at once." Madame de Maintenon knew well the general misery from the condition of her own property. She wrote to her factor, "Give little in order to give to many. A good broth will nourish for twenty-four hours. You

(1) "Madame de Maintenon et la Maison Royale de Saint-Cyr," p. 232.



have invention : try whether peas, beans, milk, and barley-meal, or something, cannot replace bread, which is so dear." Worse still were the symptoms of fierce mistrust and hatred which crossed her path, the whole significance of which was not apparent to her as it is to us who know of '89. Daily she received letters asking her whether she was not tired of sucking the blood of the poor. In one of her journeys to St. Cyr, with her carriage full of food, clothing, and money, which she distributed to the famished crowd as she went along at a footpace, so great was the press, a child, half-dead, was flung into her coach. Threats of assassination frequently reached her. "Matters have got to so violent a pitch that it cannot last," she writes. "You see people who will no longer listen to reason, and who are transported with misery. It will soon be impossible to go out with safety. The famine has put the people in such a ferment that one must not expose oneself to it. The extremity is such that I am led to hope that God is about to interfere."

There is something touching as well as grotesque in this anti-climax. This was the result of forty years' reign by divine right, assisted by spiritual pastors even more divine. France had been given to the two heavenly-appointed authorities, as it were in the palms of their hands, to do what they would with her. All odious human liberty, corporate or individual, had been carefully extirpated as a poisonous weed. Parliaments, provincial estates, municipal liberties, had been suppressed with rigour. Religious dissent had been hunted down by dragoons sword in hand. Calvinists, Quietists, Jansenists, had all in turn been persecuted with a ferocity which extorted the applause of all orthodox men, and placed Louis XIV. on a level with the greatest rulers of all time. Never had the principles of Catholic monarchy been put in practice on such a magnificent scale, with such unfettered freedom, with such mature and wide deliberation. If the experiment did not succeed on these conditions, what conditions could be accounted sufficient? All that absolutism and intolerance could demand had been granted or taken. The issue was unsatisfactory in the extreme. Not only was heresy more daring and vigorous than ever abroad, but at home, in the heart of the country ruled by the most Christian King, civilisation had stopped, or even retrograded. The population had diminished, the useful arts and agriculture were smitten with decay. A more beautiful example of the entire helplessness of Catholic monarchism before social problems has never been seen. Some distance across the Rhine there was a great Elector who, instead of impoverishing and half ruining a rich state, was building up an exhausted one with a success which astonished onlookers. Far off across the ocean, in the midst of primeval forests on the banks of the Delaware and the Hudson, plain unpolished men were laying, with the success we know, the foundation of an empire destined to

be the manifestation of principles the complete antithesis of those of the Grand Monarque. The contrast is complete.

What strikes one most in the old French monarchy is not its abuses, injustices, cruelties, but its stupidity—its entire want of even enlightened self-interest. Not only did it never carry out any serious reform, it never fairly saw the need of any, and it turned fiercely on any one who thought he did, e.g. Racine, Vauban, Boisguillebert and Fénelon.

It was a great trial to Madame de Maintenon that the king's conversion to a moral life almost coincided with the commencement of the misfortunes which filled the latter half of his reign. We can understand her vexation. That a licentious prince should be punished of God seemed to her a self-evident certainty. That a chaste and pious prince deserved divine approval and reward was equally clear. But neither of these expectations was fulfilled. While Louis's life was a scandal and outrage to all decency, his arms and policy met with splendid success. After he had reformed and become a model to all Christian kings, had shown his devotion to God by private continency and public persecution, then he was afflicted in a manner which put faith at fault. "The king has changed his manner of living," writes the Abbé Dorat; "he does secret penance, gives alms, makes long prayers, he insists that women shall be modestly dressed." The writer evidently feels he will hardly be believed. "The king has become a saint," he goes on, "he has brought back to their duty several persons. He relieves secretly numbers of poor who are ashamed of their poverty, and regrets he has not always done so. He has such concern for virgin purity, that he takes elaborate measures to preserve it. All the ladies of the court have their necks and arms covered, so that nothing but modesty is seen where they appear." If these measures, these almost incredible reforms, will not save a state, the question is what would? Madame de Maintenon, at least, never doubted that God would be at last touched by the piety of the king and the prayers of her young ladies at St. Cyr. Whenever a battle was expected, or a town besieged, during the disastrous war of the Spanish Succession, she prayed, and made her young flock pray, with a fervency which showed the stability of her faith. "The prayers of forty hours were everywhere" when the allies invested Lille. "The Duchess of Burgundy passed nights in the chapel. Alarm was depicted in every face, and this dread lasted nearly a month." "The armies," she wrote, on the eve of Malplaquet, "are confronting each other in Flanders. A courier arrived with the news at five o'clock this morning. Put all the house in prayer, I implore you, and go all of you to offer the holy sacrifice to beseech God to protect us." Now and then, in her correspondence with the *Princesse des Ursins*, a flash of irritation escapes her at the obduracy of heaven. "The designs of God are incomprehensible. Three

Christian kings"—that is, Louis, the Pretender James III., and Philip V. of Spain—"appear to be abandoned, and heresy and injustice triumph. Let us hope that it will not be for long." It was not the first time, nor was it destined to be the last, that they who have taken the field with a firm conviction they had Providence for an ally have been exposed to disappointment. Marlborough was a heretic, and Eugene an infidel, and their victories over the forces of a pious and orthodox king were not only distressing to patriotism, but seemed to throw some discredit on the divine verities of faith. More dismal years there are not in history than those which closed the long and once brilliant reign of Louis XIV. The savage war, waged with half-starved troops, led by incompetent generals; the silent anguish of the provinces which seemed to fall asleep, numbed in misery; the lugubrious pomp of Versailles, in which the failing old king moved like a spectre seeking rest—form a picture as sombre as can well be conceived. The terrible winter of 1709—10, in which half the fruit-trees perished, and which human and animal life with difficulty survived, seems like a metaphor offered by nature of the dark cold gloom which had settled on the land, stagnating the blood and the minds of men. The frightful silence is only pierced by the strident voices of theological disputants, like jackals on a battle-field, active and hungry in the midst of death.

Louis met his death, as he had his misfortunes, with more courage than might have been expected of him. "I thought," he said to Madame de Maintenon, "I thought it had been more difficult to die." The frost of old age was congealing them both. He was seventy-seven, and she eighty years old. Much has been related of doubtful truth concerning her forsaking him in his last moments. She no doubt did leave him and go to St. Cyr on the 28th of August, that is, two days before he died. But he had become unconscious, and no one expected he would revive. When he did, she was at his bedside at once. "You must have much fortitude," he said to her, "to be always present at such a spectacle." They had bidden each other farewell some days before in terms of real affection. If their words seem wanting in lofty human passion, we must remember the persons and the circumstances.

Madame de Maintenon lived four years at St. Cyr after Louis XIV.'s death. She not only received numerous messages of sympathy from the chief persons at court, but the Regent Duke of Orleans hastened to pay her a visit of condolence. He not only confirmed to her her modest pension of 48,000 francs a year (Madame de Montespan had been known to lose fifteen times that sum in a bet on a single card), but he declared to her detractors, "She did good to everybody as much as she could, and never did harm to any one." The most generous (and not wholly undeserved) tribute ever made to Madame de Maintenon.

J. COTTER MORISON.

## A FEW WORDS ON THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY BILL.

It would be vain to attempt, within the compass of these few pages, to discuss the general bearings, much less the specific details, of the Oxford Reform Bill. All I propose to do is to call attention to a few points which have not been fully considered in the House of Lords and may fail, if the Bill is dealt with hurriedly, to be properly appreciated by the House of Commons, and the remarks I have to make are made purely from an academical, not from a political point of view. Of course the Bill is not all that political Liberals would have liked: why should they expect it to be so? But it is much less reactionary than might reasonably have been apprehended. Considering how dear Conservatism and the Established Church are to one another, considering how admirable is the discipline of that Conservative majority which has just carried through both Houses a measure which few Conservatives relish, Lord Salisbury's Bill is a creditable instance of the willingness of English statesmen to accept accomplished facts, and treat them as a point of departure for further reforms. And though one cannot expect it to do all that is needed to purge and vivify the University, setting her and Cambridge fairly at the head of English education and English learning, still it affords a fair prospect of carrying out many most beneficial changes in the application of funds now wasted in needless fellowships, and in the maintenance in every college of an independent teaching staff.

Three things about the Bill have become clear. First, that it will pass this session. Second, that if vigorously worked by the Commissioners, against the resistance of the few obstructive colleges, it may do a vast deal of good. Third, that every effort should be made, irrespective of party feelings, to improve it as far as possible, make it a complete measure, and so avoid the necessity of having to plunge Oxford again, after a few more years, into the caldron of change. Final of course it cannot be. But it is most desirable that it should fairly grapple with all the questions, many of them wide and difficult ones, that now press for a solution, and thereby effect a re-settlement of the University and colleges which may leave them at leisure for their proper work for twenty or thirty years to come.

Now, the complaint commonly made against the Bill is that it is too vague and general, that it is a leap in the dark, a mere string of powers, for the wise exercise of which few and scanty directions are given. The Commissioners are left free to provide for all or for scarcely any of the objects which the Bill suggests; and no one can tell which they will consider desirable. They may, if united in view, carry through the most sweeping changes; or they may content themselves with pruning away a few fellowships and

founding a few professorships. The presence of discordant elements in the Commission itself makes this uncertainty all the greater. There ought therefore, people say, to be either a far more distinctly directory Bill, sketching in definite outline a general scheme for the Commissioners to work out, or else there ought to be a preliminary Commission of Inquiry, whose recommendations might be a basis for the action of Executive Commissioners, as in the case of the Endowed Schools Commission and the Public Schools Commission, as well as of the Oxford Commission of 1854.

The answer to these complaints is that Parliament cannot possibly prepare a scheme for the reform of the two Universities and their respective colleges. It has not the time, still less has it the special knowledge and wisdom, required for so difficult an undertaking. And to appoint a separate Commission of Inquiry would involve delay, would throw the Bill over this and the next, perhaps over several sessions of Parliament.

Admitting the force of these arguments, I desire to show that it is impossible for the present Commission to proceed properly with their work until a comprehensive scheme for the reform of University and colleges has been framed; and that the natural course is therefore to direct them to frame such a scheme before they do anything else, and for the purpose of framing it, to hold such a regular inquiry as will enable them fully to appreciate the problems to be solved, and the solutions proposed by those who have thought long and seriously upon the subject. It must be remembered that the task of this Commission is to construct, and not, as that of the last Commission in great measure was, to destroy. It has no less an enterprise set before it than the reorganization of the whole University, the reconstruction of its educational machinery, the qualifying it to discharge that duty of furthering science and learning which it has forgotten in the restless hurry of examinations. The University is unhappily at present rather an examining than a teaching body. That is, it teaches for the sake of examining, instead of examining for the sake of the teaching. Examinations lead, teaching follows. But the teaching itself has undergone an important change within the last twenty years. Formerly every college professed to be a complete, and was really an independent, educational body. When people came to see how great a waste of teaching power this attempt to make every college self-sufficing involved, colleges began to unite and group themselves for the purposes of teaching. The attempt shows what are the needs of the time, shows that the first problem which the Commission has to deal with is the removing of the main part of educational work from that college basis which has proved too narrow, to put it on the wider foundations which the University supplies. A scheme for this purpose must evidently be framed, and every college must be reformed with a view to such a scheme. For till it is settled what shall be the number, the duties,

the emoluments, of the University teachers—whether one calls them professors, or readers, or lecturers; whether one has them nominated by a University Board, or by some conjoint action of the colleges—it would be impossible to determine how many tutors or lecturers are wanted in each college, what shall be their salaries and what their duties.

Then as to the professorships themselves, not only will it be essential to know what chairs are to be created, in order to see what are the subjects for whose teaching, as sufficiently supplied by the University, the colleges need not provide, but it must be settled whether or no they are to be in any and what way connected with the colleges; whether a professor is also to be a fellow of a college; if so, what share he is to have in its government, what voice (if any) the college shall have in electing him. These are matters with which nearly every college scheme will have to deal; matters, moreover, which must be settled on some uniform principle, applying to every college alike. How, then, can the Commissioners frame a scheme for any one college, till they have laid down such principles? And still more, how can any college prepare and submit a scheme for itself, until it knows what other colleges are doing, what share of their income they are proposing to devote to University purposes, and what opinion the Commissioners have adopted upon those points which will recur in each successive scheme?

The difficulty is equally apparent when one considers the case of matters relating not so much to the University as to the internal management of each college. Are clerical fellowships to be retained? and if so, in what proportion to the whole number? Are the competitors for them to be persons already in holy orders, or may candidates be admitted on declaring their intention to be ordained? Is the government of the colleges to belong to all the fellows alike, or to whom? What college offices are needed, and with what duties and salaries? Ought headships (supposing headships included in the Bill) to be tenable for life? How are tutors and college lecturers to be appointed? Are there to be any fellowships devoted to what is called research? and if so, how is the danger of jobbery to be guarded against? Is it desirable to permit colleges to unite with one another? and if so, on what terms? Can arrangements be made for the more economical management of college estates by appointing agents to act for several colleges at once, and can improvements be introduced into the keeping and auditing of college accounts? I do not say that all these are questions which every scheme will deal with, and one or two of them may perhaps be left untouched altogether. But they all deserve to be considered, and it is impossible for a college profitably to submit its proposals for dealing with any of them, while ignorant as to the views the Commissioners have formed, and as to the rules they will apply to other colleges.

Let me endeavour to illustrate this impossibility by the instance of

the most important points of all, since they are those which absorb the greatest amount of money, college scholarships and fellowships. There is at present a rather degrading form of competition among colleges for the best boys from schools. Several colleges have not been content to rely on their social or educational reputation, but try to outbid others by offering larger pecuniary rewards to candidates. Thus the value of some college scholarships has come to be quite too high; and it is generally agreed that some such limit as £60 or £70 ought to be fixed for all colleges alike. No college, however, can venture to propose to reduce the annual income of its scholarships unless other colleges will do the like, for this would give them an inferior field to choose from. So it is often urged that boys come up too late, and that no one who is over seventeen, or at most eighteen, years of age, should in general be eligible for a scholarship (though special provision might be made for exceptional cases). Here again a uniform limit is desirable. But no one college can afford to narrow its field unless others will do the like.

No questions raised by the Bill have been so much debated as those relating to the tenure and number of the fellowships. Every scheme must deal with it, and deal with it on the same principles; yet people are greatly divided in opinion on it, in Oxford as well as in London. If colleges are left to themselves, some will propose to abolish altogether, others to retain, what are called prize-fellowships. Of those who would abolish them, some will endeavour to keep hold of the money for other college purposes, while others will be willing to devote it to the University. Of those who desire to retain them, some will give a longer, some a shorter tenure; some a larger, others a smaller income; some will remove, others uphold the restriction of celibacy. Most will put them on a level with all other fellows, but may seek to restrict their share in college management. Now suppose a set of schemes submitted containing all these different proposals for dealing with fellowships and fellowship funds. The Commissioners could not venture to approve one till they had seen and considered the others, else they would fatally tie their hands for future action. To consider all, they must weigh the merits of these various methods; that is, they must inquire how the present system or systems have worked in Oxford and in Cambridge too: they must obtain the opinions of many competent advisers, and justify by reasons a decision which, whatever its nature, is sure to be keenly criticised. And as the decision, when reached, will necessarily strike at the root of more than half of the divergent schemes submitted, the number and payment of fellowships being the central point of every scheme, those schemes will be practically rendered useless. Revised schemes will therefore have to be prepared and discussed afresh by these colleges, and by the Commissioners themselves, so as to bring their proposals into harmony with the decision given. Now since colleges will foresee all

this, the probability is that they will not submit schemes at all till they have ascertained what are the views of the Commissioners upon this vital point. Thus the "year of grace" allowed to colleges for the preparation of their schemes would expire without result, or be consumed in conferences between colleges and the Commission, which would only end by showing the necessity for an exhaustive inquiry and a comprehensive scheme.

So as to this hotly debated matter of what are called Idle or Prize Fellowships. People reason as if there were unlimited funds to be disposed of, and the only question were whether the money so spent is wasted or not. But the question is surely a purely relative one. What has to be settled is not the value of such fellowships in the abstract, but what their merits are as compared with other purposes for which money is needed: first of all with the making a sufficient provision for teaching; secondly, with the support of libraries and museums; thirdly, with the promotion of learning, research, discovery. If, as most people will agree, the providing of examination prizes to start men in life is an object desirable no doubt, but less important than those three preceding objects, the conclusion must be that we ought first to ascertain how much money is really required for those other objects, and then let the surplus go to this fourth one. Till this is ascertained, nothing can be done. It is not now known—no, not within £10,000 or £20,000; and all the discussions in Parliament, all the letters in the newspapers, all the solitary meditations of the Commissioners will not ascertain it. And into whatever department of the projected reforms we look narrowly, it will be found that the same necessity exists for obtaining facts and opinions, and for basing upon these some large and connected plan, whose principles may be applied in the case of each and every college. A piecemeal reform which attempts to deal with each college by itself, will be no reform of the University at all, and will only pave the way for renewed discontent and a renewed cry for legislative interference.

Even if the Commission were composed of men intimately acquainted with the needs and working of the University, a preliminary inquiry would be desirable to satisfy the colleges that they were being dealt with on fair and reasonable principles. But what is the fact? The Commission contains, besides its illustrious chairman, several men of the highest ability and reputation in their respective departments. But only one of them, the late Professor of International Law, has had any practical experience, as at once a resident and a teacher, of how the present system works and what people feel regarding it.

What, then, are the objections to inserting in the Bill a provision directing the Commissioners to hold an inquiry and frame a comprehensive scheme? Two only have been stated. It has been suggested



that public opinion will sufficiently guide the Commission's action. But public opinion in Oxford is divided on the most vital matters they will have to deal with. And if they try to ascertain it privately, they will be exposing themselves to be guided, perhaps misled, by hidden and irresponsible advisers, whose statements they cannot test, whose influence will excite endless jealousy in the University. Others have alleged that too much time would be consumed by an inquiry. On the contrary, time will be saved. All the evidence that is needed could be taken in twenty sittings, extending over, say, three months, and three months more might well suffice for the preparation of a report or general scheme. The principles of reform thus once determined, colleges would frame their several schemes in conformity with them, and the application of those principles to each such scheme would become a comparatively short and simple task.

Want of space prevents me from discussing several other topics connected with the proposed reforms which deserve more careful attention than they have yet received.<sup>1</sup> But it is of much less consequence that subordinate questions should be canvassed now in parliament and in print, if some security is taken for the proper investigation of the whole subject by the Commissioners. The reorganization of Oxford is a matter far more complicated and difficult than the outside world has as yet realised. It is one on which no leader of University opinion would propose a complete plan of reform without much reflection and hesitation. And it will be found impossible for a body coming to it from without, as the Commission does, having no previous knowledge of recent changes in the University, and of the light which experience has thrown upon her methods and her needs, to grapple with the problems which the coexistence of University and colleges presents, except by a comprehensive scheme, or to frame a comprehensive scheme except with the aid of a thorough previous inquiry.

JAMES BRYCE.

(1) One of these is the mode in which provision may be made not only for research but for the carrying out of various pieces of work to which University funds may fairly be applied, since they are desirable in the interests of learning or science, and yet could not be made to pay their own way; such, for instance, as the editing of a valuable book, or the collation of a manuscript, or the purchase and arrangement of a series of scientific specimens, or the delivery of a special course of lectures on some particular subject by a man of eminence brought down for the purpose. To create places of emolument subject to no obligation but that of research is at best a hazardous experiment, which the wisest men among our men of science disapprove. But the same objections do not exist to the plan of setting aside an annual sum to be applied under the directions of some competent body or bodies for the purposes of research or temporary instruction, including the execution of such pieces of work as have just been mentioned. The money would then not be given to a man in the hope that he would work, but as a payment for a piece of work actually done, liable to be discontinued if he lagged in prosecuting it further, and ending when it was complete. Such bodies as the Boards of Studies might safely be trusted to administer a common fund of this nature (just as the Councils of the British Association and the Royal Society similarly administer without reproach the funds placed at their disposal), their accounts being of course regularly presented to the University.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THERE is only one word in which to sum up the aspect of Eastern affairs. They seem '*louches*.' We cannot see clear. At any rate the alliance of the three Emperors is not broken, though it is visibly less close than it was. Things could hardly go otherwise. It is simply impossible for Russia, Prussia, and Austria to have the same interests under all circumstances. There are questions in which their interest is antagonistic, and eastern affairs constitute one of these questions. The more aggravated the eastern situation, the more urgent the necessity of action, by so much the more openly must this fundamental divergence proclaim itself. The Emperor of Russia and the Emperor of Austria are both of them, it is said, strongly desirous of peace and the restoration of order in Turkey. They profess this, and their accredited organs repeat it daily. Austria certainly must be extremely anxious for an end of existing complications. The Hungarians have an even greater interest in this direction than the Austrians. As for Russia, her interest is more complex and much less easy to determine. We have already shown (see the Review for January) that she cannot dream at this moment of going to Constantinople. She cannot then aspire after a definite settlement of the Ottoman succession, lest she should be unable to take the slice of it that would suit her best. But on the other hand it is to her advantage that Turkey should slowly break up, and that her Slav subjects should turn towards their fellow believers in Russia. Here is one clear source of divergence between Petersburg and Vienna. It is a divergence that would assert itself still more plainly if Serbia and Montenegro took part in the struggle, and if the Balkan peninsula became the theatre of a duel to the death between Turks and Slavs, Christians and Mussulmans. Austria would probably desire to intervene to prevent the Croats and Serbs in her own territory from being drawn into this great transformation, and also because the Hungarians would scarcely see without mortal disquiet the creation by their side of a Slavic Confederation. Russia on the contrary cannot suffer Austria to stifle by arms the movement of emancipation in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria. Russia may well advise, and with all seriousness, Montenegro and Serbia not to attack the Turks. But supposing these powers not to listen to her, is it open to her to leave them to be crushed by an Austro-Hungarian force? She could not do this without kindling the resentment of the whole Slav world, from the banks of the Elbe to the Ural mountains, and without losing all her prestige in the eyes of the very population whose sympathy she has the strongest reasons for conciliating. We now see that in such a case the divergence between Vienna and Petersburg could not fail to break out openly.

It is probable that Serbia and Montenegro will proceed to action, in consequence of these considerations. They cannot but see that a combined intervention of Russia and Austria is as difficult to effect as the intervention

of Austria by herself. Why should they not march to the succour of their oppressed brethren, with the idea of one day restoring the empire that was destroyed by the invasion of the Turks? It was thus that Count Bismarck proceeded at the time of the Danish war. England threatened, France threatened. But he knew that neither one nor the other would act alone, and that England would never concede to France the compensations she sought as the price of her co-operation. He went straight forward, and neither of them stirred. Probably the same thing would happen to-day if Prince Milan of Servia were to enter Bosnia. For that matter, it would be the best solution. From the moment that the powers should agree to leave the Slaves *fare da se*, their understanding would be much more easily upheld than if it became necessary to settle the particulars of intervention. Now it is a capital interest of Europe that this alliance should remain cordial and sincere. It is the pledge of peace on the continent.

Now to examine the origin of the despondent rumours that continue to circulate through Europe, though the organs that pass for reflectors of the thoughts of the Cabinets of Berlin, of Vienna, and of Petersburg convey to us in almost identical terms declarations of the most reassuring kind. According to the *Journal de St. Petersbourg* it is the speculators of the exchanges who spread abroad all these alarming reports. When we see the chief Austrian stock falling 10 per cent. and remaining at a war quotation, in spite of all pacific assurances, it is impossible to see in so grave a circumstance a mere Stock Exchange manœuvre. Let us briefly recall the disquieting signs.

To the Andrassy reforms, and to the representations of General Rodich in favour of submission, the chiefs of the insurgents of Herzegovina gave answer by claiming the six following points:—1. That one third of the land held by the Rayahs on lease should become their property. 2. That those returning should receive subsistence for one year, seed, agricultural implements, and the means to re-build their houses and churches, and should be free from tithe for three years. 3. That the Turkish troops should be withdrawn from the open country into six garrisons, namely, Niksics, Trebinje, Stolatz, Mostar, Folstra, and Plevlje. 4. That the Insurgents should keep their arms until the Mahomedan population is disarmed. 5. That the chieftains should be called together after their return to choose in concert with the authorities the new Councils. 6. That in each garrison place an Austrian and Russian Commissioner should control the completion of the Reforms.

Austria and Russia ask, not that Turkey should concede all these demands, but that she should examine them. The Porte replies that it cannot go beyond the previous concessions, and seems resolved to push on the war with vigour. It is bringing troops from Asia Minor, and even from Bagdad, though at Bagdad the plague is raging. The Sultan is furious at having yielded in the first instance; he longs for a struggle to the bitter end, and is only waiting for the moment to recall Hussein Pacha from Broussa, as he shares his master's sentiments. We can hardly hope for the establishment of any agreement between the belligerents. The Christians

believe, and rightly, that the promised reforms cannot be seriously carried into execution, even supposing the Porte to have the best possible intentions. They refuse to submit. On the other side the impotence of Turkey surpasses anything that could be imagined. Not only, after many months of conflict, is she unable to crush bands that never counted more than a very small number of combatants; her armies cannot even move with safety, nor revictual the strong places that are besieged. Only the other day, Mukhtar Pasha failed in carrying food into Niksics, when almost on the point of capitulating. What will the Turks do now that Bosnia is beginning to stir, and that, with the opening of spring, the Montenegrins, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Serbs of Austria are hastening to the help of their brethren? What is curious throughout the transaction is that these mountaineers, stripped of everything, in the poorest country in Europe, find the resources, arms, and munitions necessary for keeping up the struggle for so long. Who gives them the money for the campaign? Austria believes the situation to be grave enough to make her reinforce her frontier garrisons, and to make preparations for the mobilisation of a *corps d'armée*, and this notwithstanding the poverty of her exchequer. That, at least, is no Stock Exchange manœuvre, but a plain fact.

Another source of disquiet has been the sudden rumour that the Emperor of Russia was about to abdicate in favour of his son, and Germany for an instant thought she was to have behind her no longer the faithful ally of 1866 and 1870, but a prince who passes for absolutely anti-German. The news has been found to be false, or at least premature. But the question was raised, and everybody asked what Germany would do, if Russia from a friend became an enemy. Such a prospect could not fail to produce some bewilderment; so much so, indeed, that the *Nord Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* felt itself bound to rebuke the over-timorous in language of some asperity. "German papers have been lately discussing the present and future relations of this country with Russia. Their articles were occasioned by vague rumours and anecdotes, unsupported by trustworthy intelligence and contradicted by news of an opposite tendency. It is to be regretted that these papers, in discussing our relations to Russia, should have adopted a tone of anxiety, as though this were a weak point from which the German Empire might be exploded and destroyed at any moment. Under any circumstances the German press will do well to obey the promptings of self-respect, and to consider it a national duty to remember that, however desirable the maintenance of the German-Russian friendship may be, it must be based upon a correct appreciation of mutual interests. A friendship founded upon such a basis may be strengthened by personal sympathy; but it cannot be shaken by mere antipathy, even if such antipathy existed, which is not at present the case." It would seem that Prussia is inclined, in view of Russian defection, to turn her eyes towards Austria and towards England. This, of course, is only a glance, for so long as they can count on the Emperor Alexander, they have to avoid with the greatest care everything at all likely to give him umbrage. It is, however, a new and significant fact that people should be asking whether the moment may not come when it would be necessary to break with Russia.

The reflections that make Germany think of England as a possible ally against Russia, are of this kind. They suppose the time to be rapidly drawing nearer and nearer when England will have at last to say to the Russian generals in Central Asia, *So far and no farther*. If this word were uttered, and were cast back or evaded, how compel attention? Certainly not by sending a *corps d'armée* into Turkestan by Kashmere or Afghanistan. It is only in Europe that England can reach Russia. Alone she can do Russia no serious harm. All she can do is to block the ports of the Baltic or the Black Sea—a step that would now be wholly ineffective. Russian commerce, thanks to railways and the rights of neutral flags, would go on by way of Königsberg or Ibraila. England, therefore, must have a continental ally, who shall have the same interest as herself in hindering Russia from acquiring a decisive and irresistible preponderance. The Queen's journey and her interview with the German Emperor, followed by her private interview with the President of the French Republic, are all interpreted as signs of English preparations for a decisive attitude in face of Russia. In England we know exactly how much importance to attach to the Queen's movements, but it is instructive to see how in Germany the wish is father to the thought.

At Vienna Count Andrassy lies on no bed of roses. The differences between Trans- and Cis-Leithania are not yet arranged, and the Hungarians, who are not very reasonable in their exigencies, have even threatened to break up the Customs arrangement. All will be smoothed over, but it were better that it were done. The Ertel affair was vexatious. Our readers will remember that Baron Ertel sold the secrets of the Austrian war office to the military attaché of the Russian embassy. When this was discovered, M. Novikoff wished to quit Vienna. Governments, we may suppose, always expect to be betrayed by somebody, but when they seize the culprit, it is rather unpleasant for everybody. Austria naturally asks what so mighty interest Russia has in knowing her military secrets. M. Novikoff will answer that Russia loves to "study;" that studying Kashgar, Pamir, the Attrek, which are so far from home, it is very natural that she should like to be well informed as to what is going on at her very door on the banks of the Danube. The affair is not, in truth, very extraordinary; still it causes a certain coolness. Baron Ertel has been condemned, but M. Novikoff remains at Vienna.

The Russian and Austrian papers carry on a war with one another that is inopportune and to be regretted. The *Russki Mir*, notwithstanding the rebukes of the *Journal de St. Petersbourg*, maintains its charges against General Rodich, who must, it says, have spoken ill of Russia in presence of the insurgent chiefs. The *Neue Freie Presse* accuses Russia of duplicity. It cites the mission of M. Wesselitzky, who under the pretext of distributing succour to the Herzegovinians encouraged them, not to lay down their arms—which, it seems, is far from being true. The fact is that there is in Russia a double current, which comes to light in the Russian newspapers and in its foreign policy. The Slavophiles desire the instant dismemberment of Turkey. All their hopes and aspirations are with the insurgents. The

government, on the other hand, while it cannot abandon the Slav cause, and at heart must look upon that cause as identical with its own, still sees clearly that it could not profit by existing circumstances to establish a footing on the other side of the Danube, without provoking a coalition between Austria, Germany, and England.

In fine, in proportion as the Eastern struggle is prolonged and extended, the latent discord between Austria and Russia must become more sharply accentuated. We may admit that the two cabinets, even that of St. Petersburg, are sincere in desiring peace; nor does it seem at all true that it is the Russians who prepared and are supporting the insurrection. But the accord, which may be complete enough so long as nothing beyond a desire for peace is in question, would instantly come to an end if a necessity for action should arise. The Hungarians cannot view with complacency the establishment of a Slav confederation. The Russians, on the contrary, could not suffer Austria to put down the insurrection, and thrust back the pacified provinces under the Ottoman yoke. Two lines of policy seem open. Either the Powers may agree to leave Slavs and Turks to dispute for preponderance in the Balkan Peninsula, even were the war to go on for years, and become more extensive by the armed intervention of Servia and Montenegro. This solution would be the best, because it would put an end to all danger of serious complications between the two neighbouring empires, and would leave the course of events to the action of natural forces. This is the solution that England, France, and all the friends of peace ought to prefer. The other solution is an agreement among the Powers to induce Austria to take the part of policeman on the other side of the Save, and to restore order by a *corps d'armée*. This is the solution that is at present patronised by the German newspapers. But what difficulties stand in the way! How long is the occupation of the Turkish provinces to last? What will be done with them? If they are given back to the Ottomans, the persecution against the Christians will be more violent than ever. Would Russia allow them to be united to Hungary? Would Hungary accept them? If Austria were once engaged, would they not begin to cavil as to her means of execution, and then would she not be found to have fallen into a trap? Then there is the costly burden on Austria's exhausted exchequer,—for which there is nobody to reimburse her. On the hypothesis of Austrian intervention, the best plan would be to join Bosnia and Herzegovina to Montenegro, giving at the same time to the new state a seaport.

One would be curious to know what is thought of all this by that powerful personage, who never sleeps, who with a million and half of soldiers under his hand works at the reconstruction of the map of Europe, a task as yet by no means completed. He sorely desires peace, he says, and, to maintain that, he devotes himself to the rather thankless work of stopping all the cracks in the fabric of the triple alliance. A curious thing—his journal, the *Correspondance de Berlin*, which finds room to tell how at an election to the Institute a Prussian Herr Borchardt succeeded against a Frenchman M. Catalan, has not a syllable upon Eastern affairs. The *Kulturkampf* having somewhat lulled, it is entirely wrapped up in the concentration of

the railways in the hands of the Empire. It is always from Berlin that alarming news come, as well as all the intelligence that is favourable to the Insurgents. The interest of Prussia is that Austria should engage herself as deeply as possible in the affairs of the East, for then she would have the greater need for leaning upon Germany. All the world knows Prince Bismarck's theory, placing the centre of gravity of the Austrian Empire at Pesth.

At the very moment when last month we were congratulating the Minghetti Ministry on having presented to the Chamber a budget, with the merit of balancing, it succumbed under the hostile vote of two parliamentary groups which had coalesced. The Left and the section led by Peruzzi joined in the vote of want of confidence for entirely different reasons. The Left blaming the Ministry for their harshness towards the taxpayers, and their gentleness and toleration in face of clericalism, found additional grievances in their spending too much on the one hand, and not having a sufficiently strong army on the other. On reaching power, the Left follow in many points the policy of their predecessors, and declare their intention of respecting measures which only the other day they attacked with such extreme vivacity—for instance the Law of the Guarantees accorded to the Pope. It cannot be otherwise. The point of view changes with the benches on which members happen to sit. Besides, the Deprétis cabinet acts wisely in not breaking abruptly with the policy of the Minghetti cabinet; it had managed the public business perfectly. The Peruzzi group declared war against the late government in the name of an economic principle. There exist in Italy, as in Germany, two economic schools; *Manchesterthum*, as the Germans say, whose watchword is absolute *laissez-faire* and non-intervention, and the school of the Katheder Socialisten, who hold that the State should intervene to introduce a wider reign of justice into the relations of the different classes, and to hasten the march of civilisation. An economist of great talent, Luzzatti, belonging to the latter school, had been charged with the negotiations for renewing treaties of commerce. Although he defended himself eagerly and sometimes very eloquently against the charge of being inclined to return to protection, still he inspired misgiving in economists of the orthodox stamp. Minghetti, the author of a very fine work on the relations between ethics and political economy, was also vehemently suspected of being tainted by the poison of Katheder-Socialismus. Under the influence of these ideas, and also, it must be allowed, on account of certain political and financial necessities, he had, as we know, formed the design of concentrating in the hands of the State the whole network of the railways of the Peninsula. Signor Peruzzi piques himself on an economic orthodoxy that is free from the smallest speck of heresy. He is president of the Adam Smith society; it has undertaken for its mission to defend the ideas of *Manchesterthum* which are shielded, often very unjustifiably, under the name of the great Scotch economist. Peruzzi, once the friend and colleague of Cavour, is one of the most capable administrators and one of the most charming intelligences in Italy. The embellishments which his native

city of Florence owes to him as its Syndic, attest what could be done by the financial capacity and the artistic taste which descended to him by inheritance. The project for purchasing the railways alarmed him in his double quality of rigorous economist and prudent administrator. Notwithstanding the bonds of friendship and political sympathy connecting him with most of the members of the former ministry, he thought it his duty to help in their overthrow, as the only means of preventing Italy from embarking in that grave and delicate enterprise. It is to be regretted that Peruzzi did not join the Deprétis cabinet; it would have enabled him to live by his own strength; as it is, he can only maintain his position by the forbearance of the Tuscan group. For the Left has not a majority in the parliament.

The recent ministerial crisis in Italy shows at once one of the weaknesses and one of the strong points of politics in that country. The troublesome side is the extreme instability of the majorities, and the incessant change of ministry. The average life of a cabinet is from one to two years. Like over-clever children, they all die young. Every deputy of self-respect is commendatore and ex-minister. Every member of the Chamber either has had, or is sure to have, a portfolio. With so many generals, it is difficult to produce a disciplined army. These perpetual changes in the *personnel* of governments place obstacles in the way of any reform that requires a number of years and a spirit of continuous energy for its execution. How is the army to be reorganized, or instruction, or the finances, when every two years there comes a new minister, bringing new plans, and proceeding to undo all that his predecessor has just done? This is obviously a serious drawback to the parliamentary system with a ministry named by the majority. And such a drawback makes itself felt with all its weight in a country where majorities are so unstable as they are in Italy. A ministry chosen outside of parliament as is the case in the United States, or upheld by the royal will as in Prussia, is the only agency for conducting with perfect success the reorganization of any of the great services of the State.

In Italy the ministries are more ephemeral and the majorities more unstable than in other countries that have representative government, because there are no clearly defined and perfectly distinct parties. *Oportet hæreses esse*, says a father of the church. In order that the parliamentary system should work well, there must be definite parties, so that a deputy cannot without being guilty of treason pass from one camp to the other or desert his leaders. The leaders have thus a disciplined and obedient force at their disposal. They are able to stay in power, at least in ordinary times, until new elections have turned their majority. In Italy, though there are not great parties confronting one another, there is a great number of shades and colours. The clerical question is the only issue on which two opposed parties could meet. Now clericalism is strong enough in the country districts and even in some towns, but it has hardly any representatives in the Chambers. The ministry is therefore never sure of its majority. It has to count, first with the exigencies of the principal towns, Rome, Florence, Naples, Turin, Genoa, Venice, Milan: then with district 'particularismus,' represented by the Piedmontese, Tuscan, Neapolitan or Sicilian groups; with the different economic schools; with the partisans of France and those



of Germany : in a word with an infinitude of political molecules, that constitute a shifting sand on which nothing stable can rest. Every majority is a coalition majority that falls to pieces as quickly as it is formed : that is the cause why Italian ministries break up, often immediately after the elections have given them a considerable majority. It is not due, as in England, to tacks in opinion among the constituencies, but to some change in the grouping of the parliamentary *nuances*.

On the other hand the advent of the Left to power proves that the Italians are above narrow prejudices, imaginary terrors, and overwhelming sectarian passions. Among the members of the new ministry are men who conspired with Mazzini, men who have been exiled, men who have been condemned to death. No matter ; the king does not flinch. 'Let them come along,' he cries in his patois of the Piedmontese mountains. Neither the country, nor parliament, are alarmed at being governed by these famous drinkers of blood, who once swore the extermination of priests and kings. Even the Bourse has not winced at their accession. These fanatical republicans give out that they will study the reform of certain imposts, but meanwhile they follow the wise steps of their predecessors with perfect discretion. Then it is discovered that they are, when all is said and done, men of capacity, of good sense, and some of them even of distinction. This proves that in every group you may count upon a capable staff. Indeed, in point of political capacity, there may be even a superabundance. However this may be, the friends of peace ought to be satisfied at seeing the portfolio of justice entrusted to Signor Mancini, the eloquent president of the *Institute of International Law*, the eminent professor who defended the abolition of capital punishment, and persuaded the Italian parliament to pass a resolution in favour of international arbitration.

France continues to enjoy untold prosperity, and it is a prosperity that she has richly earned by her prudence and wisdom. Paris is full of foreign gold ; the revenue continues to increase ; the Bank has in its coffers nearly two millions of bullion. To confirm in the eyes of Europe the peacefulness of her intentions, the ministry has conceived the clever and telling idea of a Universal Exhibition in Paris a couple of years hence. This must have given pleasure in Berlin, where they vow they never dreamt of the dark projects that were so unkindly imputed to them twelve months ago. A state which invites other nations,—even that which triumphed over it and dismembered it,—to take a part in the festival and emulation of industry, can scarcely be thinking of war. It becomes as it were a sort of neutral ground—a Holy Land vowed to civilisation. This is a fit and noble design, which all nations ought to applaud and support.

The complementary elections are still favourable to the Republicans, and what gives the measure of the change of feeling which has been produced in favour of the Republic, is the nomination of M. Gambetta as President of the Commission of Finance. His previous studies may not seem to mark him out for this high function. But it is a question, we are told, of settling the large sums that are necessary for the reconstruction of the Army, and in this patriotic task the President of the Republic, M.

Thiers, and M. Gambetta are all three of one mind. Is it not shameful for our epoch that at a moment when all the nations in Europe have the most evident interest in preserving peace, we should still be asking with eager anxiety, Shall we have war? Count Andrassy, more likely than anyone else to know the problem, answers for peace for a year. As for the year after he would rather not promise. No doubt causes of conflict abound, but whence is the signal for the struggle to come? Russia is not ready; France is not ready; Austria never will be ready; Germany, which is always ready, cannot fight without an ally. Twelve months of truce, broken by perpetual alarms—this then is all that our rulers can promise us. It is little.

At home the genial and confident species of Liberal politicians who trust to recover power by the blunders of their opponents, and not by any statesmanship of their own, are reviving. They have no measures, no policy, nothing positive, and nothing constructive, no ideas of improvements, no reforming inventions. But they think they discern reasons for hoping that the most stupid, selfish, and irrationally capricious of the borough constituencies which went over to the Conservative party last time, are making ready to go over to the Liberal party next time. We can have no particular objection to these ingenious forecasts. They are a natural occupation for clever egotists in a system of party government. "I daresay," Daniel Deronda tells Sir Hugo, "many better fellows than I, don't mind getting on to a platform to praise themselves, and giving their word of honour for a party." But one cannot help reflecting how many improvements in government would be secured if these clever men could be induced to devote one half of the intense and alert interest which is constantly alive in them as to elections and seats, to what are the ends and aims of all this political machinery. Perhaps the time will come when mere party talk, without the slightest reference express or implied to the goals and reasons of party, will seem as disgusting and ignoble as decent men now think the favourite subject of the great Sir Robert Walpole. It is certainly true that people are disappointed with the performance of the government which they placed in power. We are not thinking of their one or two blunders, nor of their one or two jobs. Their predecessors made as many blunders of the same sort, and even in the way of jobs were not by any means wholly without guile. These things are unfortunately incident to ministries of every kind. The failure of the Conservatives is not merely superficial. They have shown a want of character, of marked colour, of real quality. Mr. Cross deserves credit for two good measures, and the purchase of the Canal shares may prove to be less of a gratuitous blunder than at first it seemed to men of cool heads. But there has been no other evidence of capacity, or of tone and character. Nobody feels the kind of confidence in these men which was felt in the Conservative administration of Lord Palmerston. They have no *cachet*, except that of mediocrity; and their mediocrity is not solid and organic, for even that would be a *cachet* of a kind. Their mediocrity is disintegrated by the master of the puppets. Their *régime* is one of square-toed humdrum, disguised by blazes of indiscretion.

It may be said that the country is taking no harm. If this means that the ministers are inflicting no serious positive injury on the country, it may be true, though in the face of increased expenditure even this is doubtful. But there is such a thing as negative damage. We know how many political advantages of various kinds we possess, but we do not know and cannot attempt to measure of how many more we are deprived by the want of initiative, purpose, and foresight, not only among the Conservative ministers, but among the Liberal aspirants to their places. An eminent publicist once said that when he first came to London and saw the leading politicians of the day, he was startled to find that not one of them—save, perhaps, Sir George Lewis—was looking at all ahead of the hour, or ever dreamed of independently using his mind on economic and political problems. Nor can we wonder very much at this, if we reflect on the incessant calls made upon the time of men in public life; though it is impossible to forget that Mr. Gladstone, to whom we owe so many important fiscal improvements, has been one of the busiest ministers that ever lived. Whatever the excuse may be worth, the unwelcome fact remains that the Conservatives, on coming into power after years of opposition and leisure, are found not to have a single political improvement of even the third or fifth magnitude, to offer as their contribution to the history of legislation. It is true that the Budget of this month extends the range of exemptions under the Income Tax. Incomes under £150 are to pay nothing, and incomes between £150 and £400 are to pay nothing on £120 of their amount. That this extension is a measure of considerable significance cannot be denied, though there is a wide difference of opinion as to its wisdom. Mr. Gladstone has denounced it as socialistic in its tendency. Others regard it as widening the already perilous divorce between the power of voting a policy, and the responsibility of paying for it. On the whole, however, it seems, so far as it goes, to be a fair set-off in favour of the humbler section of the middle class, against the exemptions of the artisans, on the one hand, and the light succession duty of the rich on the other. As for its being socialistic, the term is an arbitrary one, and if we may offer a still more radical objection to Mr. Gladstone's remark, is it worth while to strain at the socialism of a graduated income-tax, while we swallow the very camel of socialism in the shape of a poor-rate, which is practically nothing less than a rate in aid of wages? We are not discussing the justice or expediency of legislative relief of the poor; we are only pointing out that if the humbler middle class make heavy sacrifices to the socialistic spirit when they pay poor-rates, they have a claim to receive such advantages as may be possible from the socialistic spirit somewhere else. Certainly the extension of the exemptions is not a Conservative measure in the ordinary sense, and as certainly—to return to our point—it is no novel contribution to the principles or practice of government. Men who in opposition gave up their whole minds to the aspirations, devices, and calculations of party strategy, are not likely to show fertility of resource or originality of conception when they succeed to office. They can go on in the easy grooves of routine; they can raise the income-tax from twopence to threepence in the pound, to save themselves the trouble and personal risk of

initiating a scheme for an army, at once rational, effective, and economical. But they cannot, for example, deal with that scandal of our finance, the confused and unintelligent system of local taxation. This may seem a very dull subject to rising young politicians in search of a telling cry, yet if they remembered Burke's saying that the State is finance and finance is the State, for on finance depends all reformation and improvement, they might see a field for many a laurel in what looks the most unattractive region in politics. Why should the Conservatives not have prepared to deal with this? Because our party system produces for one statesman, a thousand perfunctory waiters on parliamentary providence. And the worst of this, as we are so often saying, is not merely the waste which it causes of possible improvements in government, but the extent to which it nourishes the mischievous and sapping spirit of political scepticism outside of parliament.

The defeat (April 26) of Mr. Forsyth's Bill for conferring the franchise on unmarried women with property was more marked than last year. It was rejected by 239 against 152: last year the same number voted in its favour, but only 187 voted against it. Whatever may be thought of the merits of the Bill, the tone of most of those who oppose it is certainly lower, more trivial, and more gross than marks any other parliamentary subject. Mr. Bright's speech against a proposal for which he had once voted, was open to none of the censure that is due to such speeches as Mr. Leatham's and Mr. Smollett's. It was serious and dignified, and expressed the temper of conservatism and suspicion about social improvement, in a way that naturally told very weightily in a chamber that was chosen to keep the world exactly where it is.

In the division (April 5) on Mr. Dixon's Bill, involving the establishment of school boards all over the country, the minority (160 against 281) was almost identical with that of last year. The bulk of the liberal party, with Lord Hartington at their head, supported the measure. The hostile majority was larger than in last year's division for the simple reason that, in view of Lord Sandon's coming proposals, the party whip was more vigilant. It is admitted on one side as on the other, that compulsion has wrought wonders. Non-attendance and irregularity are no doubt, as Sir J. Kay-Shuttleworth says in another page, the main causes of the deeply unsatisfactory results of our efforts to instruct the people. But in some of the largest towns in England it has been proved that these difficulties can be reached by compulsion. In Sheffield and Birmingham, for example, the average attendance has been raised more than 100 per cent. since the formation of the School Boards. If compulsion is to be made universal, it can only be entrusted to a representative authority. The magistrates are not to be dreamed of as the depositories of this power. The government inspectors are equally open to the same kind of objections. By all means avoid the creation of new local authorities if possible. But in the country districts what fit and proper authority exists? To make the Board of Guardians an educational instrument would be to surround education itself with a host of odious associations. It may be possible to utilise for our present purpose Local Boards, Boards of Commissioners, and rural and urban sanitary authorities. And the greater the

responsibilities of these and all such bodies, the better. If parliament is reluctant to entrust compulsion to them, and where no bodies of the kind already exist, then a School Board is the only practicable agency.

The hypocritical solicitude of the sectarian party for the pocket of the ratepayer is moonshine. The cost of a School Board depends entirely on the work it has to do. If it is required to buy land, to build schools, and so forth, the money must be found; if it is not found, the children will go uneducated, and this is the most wasteful and costly luxury in which the well-to-do part of any nation can indulge themselves. Where a Board has not to do heavy work in land and bricks and mortar, —where, that is to say, the accommodation is sufficient,—then the cost of putting compulsion into force is very trifling. It is pitiable to see a powerful party lending itself to the clamour about cost. Such clamour really has its source not in the amount of school rate, but in the irrational way in which it is levied. The smallest addition to local rates is severely felt in England, because in England local rates are raised as they are in no other country in the world. A man with an income of fifty thousand pounds may live in a house with a rental of five hundred pounds a year. He pays local rates only upon that. A shopkeeper finds it necessary to occupy premises of the same rateable value, in order to make an income of a thousand a year. He thus pays fifty times as much in rates as his wealthier neighbour. Is it any wonder that the shopkeeping class grumble at any addition to a kind of taxation that already presses so heavily upon them?

One of the most eagerly discussed events of the month has been the publication of the Report of Mr. Cave's mission to Egypt. Putting aside all question of the reliability of the figures furnished to Mr. Cave, and the practical possibility of the entire reform of Egyptian management upon which his calculations depend, it seems worth while to consider whether, taking Mr. Cave's own figures, he is really in any degree justified in the conclusion to which he comes, and which the Chancellor of the Exchequer in a vague way seemed to adopt, *viz.* "that the resources of Egypt are sufficient, if properly managed, to meet her liabilities." We may put aside also the obvious criticism that Mr. Cave supposes a conversion of the floating debt on terms which it is evident that the bondholders will not willingly accept, inasmuch as it involves a heavy loss to them, and that the forcible conversion of the floating bonds, or even the postponement which has already taken place, is just as clearly a failure to meet engagements as the most complete repudiation. We will suppose Mr. Cave's conversion to be effected, and then see whether his calculations are financially reasonable.

The figures of income and expenditure furnished to Mr. Cave are substantially identical with those published some months before. In a recent article on Egypt in this Review Sir George Campbell expressed the belief, with reference to those figures, that if the "Mokabilah" were really, as had been stated, a capitalisation of the land revenue, the figured statement was on the face of it a confession of utter insolvency. Does Mr. Cave's explana-

tion in any way shake this conclusion? He puts the present balance-sheet in a slightly different form from that before published, inasmuch as he brings out a surplus excluding the floating debt, and adds to the surplus figure this note:—"which will serve for paying the interest of the floating debt;" in other words, the figures given make income and normal expenditure just to balance. We say normal, for Mr. Cave makes clear that this statement excludes the extraordinary expenditure for the Abyssinian war, &c., for which he elsewhere makes a special provision of £1,000,000. In fact he assigns for the whole military and marine charges scarcely £900,000, a sum manifestly insufficient for the establishments and expeditions now maintained.

However, as Mr. Cave puts it, he makes "the present revenue of Egypt" to be £10,689,070, and the normal expenditure about the same. He confesses that by 1886 the "revenue" will be largely diminished, but he propounds a plan to meet the loss.

Now first, it seems wholly unjustifiable to speak of the £10,689,070 as present revenue. So far from meeting the suggestions that the Mokabilah is not revenue but capital, Mr. Cave explains that part of the subject in a way to show it to be much worse than had been previously supposed. He shows that the arrangement is, that the Khedive has solemnly pledged himself, in consideration of the present payment of the Mokabilah, to remit an annual land revenue not of half (as previously stated), but of the whole amount of the Mokabilah, or rather of the whole amount received, plus eight and one-third per cent. allowed by way of discount. According to his own figures there will thus be a—

Total loss in 1886 of Mokabilah payments completed . . .	£1,531,118
Reduction of land revenue in consideration of the Mokabilah from £4,305,131 to £2,634,824 . . . . .	£1,671,307
Total loss of revenue . . . . .	£3,202,425

Surely it is totally unreasonable to treat as present revenue an income of which upwards of three millions sterling are avowedly not revenue but an expenditure of capital. What would be thought of an Indian balance-sheet drawn up on these principles? Clearly, at present at least, there is an enormous deficit in Egyptian finance, even when the expeditions beyond the frontier are excluded.

There is a very curious statement about this Mokabilah in the covering letter with which the report was sent—*viz.*, that at the last moment the Khedive naively informed the Commission that he had discovered a serious error in his calculations, and that the land tax would be more seriously diminished than he had anticipated, so that in 1886 he would lose £2,500,000. This cannot include the Mokabilah itself, for, as already shown, the original calculation involves a much greater loss, and although the letter says that the £2,500,000 has been taken into consideration in the tables accompanying the report, this figure cannot be traced there. Leaving aside, however, any further diminution which the Khedive's new-born candour may bring to light, it is enough for the present to repeat that Mr. Cave's calculations show that, of the present so-called revenue,

£8,202,425 is not revenue, but a temporary payment of capital, to meet the cessation of which provision must be made. Let us see how he makes this provision. He does it in this wise. By reducing the interest on the floating debt, postponing the sinking funds, and unifying the debts, he saves from £1,800,000 to £1,400,000 on the payments on this account. He further transfers an annual debt payment of £672,608 to the Daira account (which another part of the report shows to be wholly unable to bear such a charge), thus making a total reduction of loan payments of, in round numbers, £2,000,000. Then he assumes a progressive increase of land revenue of half a million, and of other taxes to nearly the same amount, or, in round numbers, £1,000,000; total, £8,000,000. He seems to assume some small reductions of normal expenditure, and the entire avoidance of all extraordinary expenditure of every kind, and further supposes that by immediate economies before the Mokabilah ceases, something may be saved out of the Mokabilah, and used to reduce the debt so as to establish an equilibrium, or rather better. That is briefly his plan.

Such a plan savours much more of the sanguine calculations of the chairman of a company in deficit, than of real and sound finance. Is it reasonable to calculate that in a country situated as Egypt is, there will be continued increase of revenue with a continued repression of expenditure, and an entire abstention from all extraordinary charges? Evidence accumulates on all sides to show that the present great revenue has only been attained as the result of a great inpouring of capital and the great rise in the price of cotton, and that it means the extremest oppression of the unhappy fellahs and labourers, whose burdons have been continually increased while the cost of living has become infinitely higher. Now that the price of cotton has fallen hugely, and that the artificial stimulus of fresh loans and lavish expenditure must be withdrawn, it is impossible to calculate on a further progress of the revenue, such as has hitherto been enjoyed. Egypt, like Bombay, depends on cotton, as in India the sugar manufacture on European methods has failed. A recent instructive paper on the Fellaheen, in the *Times*, shows very plainly how everything depends on cotton, and how the price of cotton has gone down from fifty-five dollars in the American war to eleven and a half dollars in the present season, so that it now ceases to be profitable.

Altogether Mr. Cave's calculations are far too sanguine, and the attempt to meet Egyptian engagements in the sense of paying 7 per cent. all round on the nominal capital of all the loans, must lead to further trouble and disappointment. The plan of Sir G. Elliott and Mr. Lloyd seems a more practical one, founded on a better knowledge of the country. They propose to reduce the nominal capital of the debt, with reference to prices of issue, about 20 per cent. all round, on an average, and then to pay 6 per cent.; or, in other words, they would have the Khedive re-engage to pay about 5 per cent. on the nominal capital of his debts. With good management and strict abstention from warlike expeditions, so much may possibly be met, but certainly not the more liberal payments proposed by Mr. Cave.

April 27, 1872.

THE

# FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

---

No. CXIV. NEW SERIES.—JUNE 1, 1876.

---

## THE NEW DOMESDAY BOOK.

THE blue book which furnishes the matter for this article has been long looked for, and had it been well done would have been of great value. In the discussion which must precede any thorough revision of the land laws it would have been well if we had been fully supplied with authentic and relevant facts. Unfortunately the book before us throws very scanty light on the questions which suggest themselves in dealing with the land tenure of England. Some general results of an approximate character we shall be able to glean from its pages; but we must say at the outset that from its omissions and from its careless composition its value as a means of information is comparatively small.

It would not be fair to blame altogether the Local Government Board for these deficiencies. In the first place, the scope of the inquiry delegated to them was far too limited. The origin of the return was a speech of the Earl of Derby in February, 1872. His purpose avowedly was to disprove the statements made by many, and prominently by Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. John Bright, and Mr. Goldwin Smith, as to the small number of persons who owned the land of England, and that that number was diminishing by the absorption of small holdings through the operation of the existing laws. Mr. Bright, in a speech at Rochdale (November, 1863), had said, "With laws such as we have, which are intended to bring vast tracts of land into the possession of one man, that one man may exercise vast political power, that system is a curse to the country, and dooms the agricultural labourer I say to perpetual poverty and degradation."

We remember Mr. Goldwin Smith's account of the attempted arrest of Hampden, "and how 4,000 freeholders of Buckinghamshire rode up to protect him. Where are those 4,000 freeholders of Buckinghamshire now?" asked Mr. Goldwin Smith, and Mr. Disraeli was supposed to have made a very witty repartee when he



answered the query, "Where you would expect to find them—in the county of Bucks." We shall see from this blue book how far the answer was justified.

On many other occasions these and other prominent liberals have dealt with this question of the ownership of land, and sometimes have, no doubt, been led into making exaggerated statements as to the concentration of it in very few hands. This book will be of use in this respect, that henceforward we shall be able to tell within comparatively close limits what is the extent of great estates, and how far the land is owned by small proprietors. But the return will not do much more than this. One point in which it is very defective is in not discriminating between town and country. The Scotch landowners' return is much more satisfactory in this respect. And as to house property, the statement of owners is very deceptive; the return sets down leaseholders of more than 99 years as owners. This greatly misrepresents the value of the ground landlords' interest in many of the large towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire, where the land is let for 999 years, or on chief rent. On the other hand, we cannot doubt that many leaseholders for short terms are set down as freeholders. It would have been far more satisfactory if the towns had been returned separately from the country; and if in the towns the ground landlord and the intermediate lessees had been all set down.

But, besides the faulty and inadequate method and scope of this inquiry, we have to complain of great inaccuracy and carelessness in the compilation. This carelessness and ignorance are not surprising when we consider on whom we have to depend in the last resort for the materials. The returns have been furnished by the clerks to the poor law guardians. Of late years there has been a column in the rate book for the name of the owner; but as the owner is not rated, this column is to a certain extent surplusage, and therefore is either not filled up, or filled up at random; or an old entry of an owner is allowed to remain on, though the ownership has for some time been changed.

Again, the clerk to the guardians has to depend on the parish overseer for his information on this point. The overseer is very often a small farmer, or even a mechanic. Many of them are very ignorant, and very unwilling to take any trouble, besides having little experience in drawing up statements. The office of overseer is not one which as a rule is desired, and consequently in many parishes the ratepayers are forced to serve in rotation. Thus we have a number of new men coming into office who know and care for nothing but to get through their year's duty with the least possible trouble.

Another cause of error in the returns is that as they come from the different unions, where a landowner has land in two separate unions, he may easily appear twice over, since there does not seem to have been any comparison of the different lists in the country, but

only in the Local Government office. We are told in the introduction that upwards of 300,000 applications to clerks have been made in order to clear up this matter of double entries. Whatever may have been the number of corrections, even a casual examination of the book shows a great number of errors still apparent on the face of it, and there is reason to suspect a very great many more. To give a few instances of these errors, we find in Cheshire, Mr. William Legh, of Lyme Hall, Disley, returned as owning 1,633 acres, and next to him we find Mr. W. J. Legh, as owning 5,109 acres—these two owners being one and the same; but the probability being that the one return was made by the clerk of the Macclesfield Union, the other by the clerk to the Stockport Union. So again, in Cheshire, the Rev. T. F. Hayhurst appears as the owner of 7,353 acres. The same gentleman has been returned under the name of France, as the owner of 2,418 acres. There are two other entries of land, one of 933 acres, the other of 151 acres, which, though belonging to the same gentleman, are set down separately. These mistakes cannot of course be corrected in the London office. A local assessment committee or some such body is the only one that can be expected to get county returns corrected. A very cursory inspection of the blue book revealed several other similar cases of double entry, sometimes because as to one property the name of a dead father was kept up, and for another property the name of the son now owning it was inserted; sometimes, where the owner has a double name, in the one case the property is set down to one name, in another to another.

One source of great deception in this blue book is the way in which the ownership of glebes by the clergy is treated. Sometimes they are properly returned in italics as corporations: The Rector of A, the Vicar of B. Sometimes the clergy are set down by their names as owners, as though they were private proprietors. Sometimes the clergyman is omitted entirely from the list of proprietors, whether in his own name or in that of his church. To give one or two instances of this, we may notice that the Bishop of Carlisle is set down in Cumberland simply as the Rev. Harvey Goodwin, Rose Castle, 162 acres. The Rev. Thomas Erskine, Rector of Ufton, is set down as a private landowner in Berkshire.

In Cheshire hardly any of the clergy are entered as corporations; not more than four for the whole county.

This omission of many of the clergy from the list in their corporate capacity, and the entry of them as private landowners, makes a great difference in the number of private landowners appearing in the blue book—especially when we consider that there are more than 10,000 clergy owning glebes of more than an acre, and who, therefore, should appear separately.

The column of valuation is still more deceptive than the column of acreage.

In the first place, the valuation including only the valuation for rateable purposes, there is no entry of mines, other than coal mines. Way leaves, a source of so much profit in the mining districts, do not appear, nor do rights of shooting. Again, as to collieries, the column of value merely includes the rateable value of the colliery, not the royalty paid, which may exceed or fall below the rateable value. As to houses, the framers of the report have set down in some cases the whole rateable value to the ground landlord who is only reversioner, in other cases they have omitted the ground rent altogether. Thus the value set down to the Earl of Stamford from his Lancashire property is notoriously inadequate, the whole town of Ashton-under-Lyne being his. Similarly other Lancashire proprietors, such as Lord Egerton of Tatton, Sir Humphrey de Trafford, the Earl of Wilton, and many others do not appear at all accurately, on account of the land about Manchester being let in perpetuity or for 999 years.

The recent blue book on the financial condition of the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, gives us an opportunity of testing the return before us in certain cases, and so inferring the value of those details which we cannot test.

The following are some of the results.

In the county of Cambridge the parallel columns below show the acreage of the college property as set forth by their own detailed returns specifying each farm, and as set forth in the landowners' blue book from the clerks to the guardians. We must remark that these college returns do not include the acreage of their house property, and, therefore, will be a little under the mark, and woodlands have not been included, because as they are commonly not rateable, the rating returns would not include them.

#### CAMBRIDGE COLLEGES—PROPERTY IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

	University Financial Returns.			Landowners' Blue Book.	
St. Peter's . . .	2,265	+	356		1,909
Clare . . .	2,822	+	287		2,535
Pembroke . . .	2,087	+	17		2,060
Gonville and Caius . .	1,838	+	162	{ 1,514 }	1,676
Trinity Hall . . .	778	+	61	{ 162 }	717
Corpus Christi . . .	1,801	+	162		1,639
King's . . .	1,872	—	108		1,980
Queen's . . .	2,409	—	59		2,488
St. Catharine's . . .	826	—	181	{ 989 }	1,007
Jesus . . .	2,332	+	95	{ 18 }	2,237
Christ's . . .	2,184	—	160		2,344
St. John's . . .	3,182	+	732		2,450
Magdalen . . .	189	+	3		186

Carried forward

University Financial Returns.					Landowners' Blue Book.	
Brought forward						
Trinity	.	.	2,336	+	467	1,869
Emmanuel	.	.	232	+	8	224
Downing	.	.	5,031	—	1,350	7,381
<hr/>						
33,284 acres.						32,682 acres.

Thus, after allowing for small variations, we have such instances of gross neglect as the following:—St. Catharine's is entered twice, for 18 acres and for 989 acres. Gonville and Caius is entered for 162 acres, and again as Caius for 1514. To Downing College there is an excess of land of 1,350 acres set down, giving the college more land in Cambridgeshire than it has in all England. Trinity is deficient by 467 acres, and St. John's by 732 acres.

A similar table for the Oxford colleges, in Oxfordshire, gives the following results.

#### OXFORD COLLEGES—PROPERTY IN OXFORDSHIRE.

University Financial Returns.					Landowners' Blue Book	
University	.	.	85	—	24	109
Balliol	.	.	339	—	73	472
Merton	.	.	1,303	+	8	1,295
Exeter	.	.	1,980	—	16	1,936
Oriel	.	.	2,125	+	229	1,896
Queen's	.	.	2,311	+	425	1,886
New	.	.	5,903	+	1,159	4,744
Lincoln	.	.	992	+	124	868
All Souls	.	.	1,180	+	4	1,176
Magdalen	.	.	5,001	+	1,734	3,267
B. N. C.	.	.	2,286	+	675	1,611
C. C. C.	.	.	1,544	—	139	1,683
Christ Church	.	.	10,596	+	5,759	4,837
Trinity	.	.	2,300	+	1,977	323
St. John's	.	.	3,188	+	279	2,909
Jesus	.	.	614	+	12	602
Wadham	.	.	672	+	563	109
Pembroke	.	.	441	—	1	442
Worcester	.	.	216	—	3	219
<hr/>					<hr/>	
43,076					30,381	

Here we have even a worse disproportion than before. In the case of Cambridgeshire, we may suppose that to a large extent lands have been given from one college to another, for the totals nearly balance. But in Oxfordshire, we have a very great disproportion; nearly 13,000 acres have gone astray and remain unaccounted for. Probably in many cases the land has been set down to the tenants as owners. There is strong reason to believe that this is the case with Trinity in reference to numerous copyholds for lives held of the college in the parish of Wroxton. Many of the names of the tenants of the college appear in the landowners' return as owners, and though the statements of acreage do not exactly tally, yet

probably it would turn out to be so, especially as the 323 acres set down to Trinity College in the landowners' blue book, correspond pretty nearly with the 346 acres of corporate college property held at rack rent; the 1,454 acres, which are let on beneficial lease, having most likely nearly all been credited to the occupier.<sup>1</sup>

A few other discrepancies as to college property, culled from other counties, will suffice to show how little reliance can be placed on this new Domesday book.

In Lincolnshire the landowners' returns give 1,539 acres to Magdalen College, Oxford. The college's own return shows 2,193 acres on beneficial lease, 142 acres rack rented, 44 acres trust property, a total of 2,379 acres.

The landowners' return gives 5 acres 3 roods in Lincolnshire to Oriol College. The college itself returns no lands in Lincolnshire.

In Devonshire, King's College, Cambridge, is entered twice over in two successive lines, with different addresses; in the first instance as owning 102 acres, in the next as owning 2,677. In fact King's College has in Devonshire 3,127 acres. In the same county, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, is set down for 246 acres in the landowners' blue book. The college returns 714 acres in its own statement of college property. In Essex the landowners' blue book gives 571 acres to Brasenose College. The college returns 635 acres. The landowners' blue book gives 129 acres to Magdalen College, Oxford, in Essex. Neither Magdalen College, Oxford, nor Magdalene College, Cambridge, returns any lands in Essex.

Oriol College returns 2,569 acres in Berkshire; the landowners' blue book gives it only 1,740 acres in that county. St. John's, Oxford, has 5,551 acres in Berkshire; the landowners' blue book gives the college only 3,668 acres. University College is returned as owning 47 acres instead of 94 acres.

Merton College has 1,025 acres in Cambridgeshire, but is set down for only 108 acres.

These few figures are enough to show that this blue book has been most carelessly compiled, and that in all probability it greatly exaggerates the number of owners by setting down occupiers as owners, besides entering the same owner over and over again. Having said so much of the deceptive character of the blue book, and of the way in which it exaggerates the number of owners, let us now see how far (taking it for what it is worth) it justifies the views of those who procured its publication. And first let us examine the status of those 4,000 freeholders of Bucks, who according to the right honourable member for that county are still there. The return gives us 3,288 freeholders above an acre, owning 455,056 acres, and 6,420

(1) Henry Fox, of Newthorp, is entered as owner in Landowners' blue book for 346 ac. 3r. 14p. The same name is entered for the same acreage as tenant on beneficial lease from Trinity College, Oxford: other instances might be cited.

owners below an acre, owning 1,153. These last must be nearly all either owners of houses or cottages in the small towns and villages, and in no respect correspond to Hampden's yeomen, who were prepared to ride up on their own horses to defend their member. But perhaps Mr. Disraeli thinks that the 3,288 owners of 455,056 acres, that is of all the county except the 1,100 acres above mentioned, and 3,000 acres of waste, are fairly representative of the same class. Let us investigate the book a little more closely.

First of all we find that of these owners 268 are corporations, owning 23,859 acres; the principal being the University of Oxford, and 20 colleges, owning 11,177 acres; seven railway companies owning 2,087 acres; the Mercers' Company owning 1,384 acres; the Crown more than 700 acres; the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and 4 deans and chapters 1,676 acres.

Thus we have left 3,020 owners, owning 431,197 acres. Of these

2 own more than	10,000 acres	26,620
2 „	9,000 to 10,000 „	19,470
2 „	7,000 to 8,000 „	14,853
1 „	6,000 to 7,000 „	6,688
4 „	5,000 to 6,000 „	21,422
4 „	4,000 to 5,000 „	18,021
9 „	3,000 to 4,000 „	29,494
22 „	2,000 to 3,000 „	49,193
35 „	1,000 to 2,000 „	47,213
<hr/>		<hr/>
81		232,974

Thus more than half the private land of the county is owned by 81 persons, who may be considered to fall within the class of squires, great and small.

Of the remaining area, three-quarters are owned by about 517 proprietors, whose property ranges between 1,000 and 100 acres. More than four-fifths of the remaining land of the county is owned by less than 1,100 small holders, owning between 10 and 100 acres each, and it is very much straining the definition of a yeoman to include even men holding as little as 20 acres, much more those between 20 acres and ten; but even with this liberal extension of the term, we have only about 1,700 freeholders other than such as hold little more than a cottage and a field or so, instead of the 4,000 men able to take horse on an emergency, and march to the defence of their threatened liberties. Perhaps the historians have exaggerated, and there never were 4,000 substantial yeomen in Bucks. It certainly seems strange that with the much smaller population of those days, probably not more than one-third of what there is now in the county, and with the much greater quantity of waste and unenclosed land, to say nothing of the rude style of farming, there should ever have been any number of men at all approaching to 4,000 owning

horses, and free to set out from home on any public errand. Still, after making liberal allowances for exaggeration, the fact must remain which none can deny, unless pleading as advocates, that the Buckinghamshire of the middle of the seventeenth century contained a sturdy race of independent farmers who have disappeared at the present day.

Indeed, even the tenant farmers then were more independent than they are now. The custom of leasing land for lives, and renewing the lease on payment of a fine, created a substantial interest in the tenant; and though there might be a relation of dependence to the lord of the manor, which was in harmony with the much more strongly-marked social distinctions of the time, yet in substance the farmer was free and could not be disturbed in his holding. The labourer, too, though subject to severe legal disabilities, had practically considerable independence. Land was not so valuable then as now. On the wastes he could build a cottage and cultivate a garden, which became his freehold; on the common he could graze a cow. And though, no doubt, the hours of work may have been long, and the living rough, yet it is probable that in physical force and in health the peasant of those days was superior to what he is now.

We may sum up the way in which the land of Buckinghamshire is held at the present day roughly as follows:—

268 corporations, owning . . . . .	23,859 acres
81 large owners of 1,000 acres and upwards .	232,974 „
517 middling owners between 1,000 and 100 acres . . . . .	145,090 „
About 1,100 small owners from 10 acres to 100 acres, about . . . . .	47,000 „
„ 1,350 cottagers and crofters, from 1 to 10 acres, about . . . . .	5,000 „
6,430 owners of less than an acre . . . . .	1,153 „
Waste . . . . .	3,000 „
9,746	458,076

The census gives 467,000 acres, but in this are included the roads, churches and church-yards, unrated plantations, &c.

Thus we see that according to the blue book some 5 per cent. of the county is owned for public purposes by the State, by charities, hospitals, colleges, ecclesiastical corporations, or local bodies for the poor, the highways, schools, &c.; 50 per cent. is owned by large proprietors of the class of gentry; 42 per cent. is owned by the yeomanry, if we take that word in a very extended sense as going as low as ten acres; and of the remaining 3 per cent., about half is house property, the remainder waste or not rated.

Without going into the same detail for other counties, I give a table which I have worked out from the whole blue book, and which I believe is approximately correct, showing the distribution

of land throughout England and Wales in the different counties in estates of 1,000 acres and upwards. Of course the real number of large landowners is much less than is shown in this table, and their acreage considerably greater, since, first, each landowner appears as often as he has an estate of 1,000 acres and upwards in more than one county, and there are 351 repeated entries of owners of more than 1,000 acres for the Peerage alone. Besides, many of these large owners have other estates of less than 1,000 acres, which greatly swell the total of their acreage, and many of them are entered twice over in the same county. However, subject to all these deductions, I find the facts as gathered from the blue book, allowing for errors and neglecting small fractions, to be as follows:—

Estates over	10,000 acres	288	5,285,700 acres
„ „ 9,000 to 10,000 „	52	492,700 „	
„ „ 8,000 to 9,000 „	76	534,700 „	
„ „ 7,000 to 8,000 „	88	656,100 „	
„ „ 6,000 to 7,000 „	118	768,200 „	
„ „ 5,000 to 6,000 „	204	1,106,000 „	
„ „ 4,000 to 5,000 „	239	1,067,500 „	
„ „ 3,000 to 4,000 „	524	1,818,700 „	
„ „ 2,000 to 3,000 „	951	2,299,600 „	
„ „ 1,000 to 2,000 „	2,432	3,469,000 „	
		<hr/>	
		4,972	17,498,200

These estates are those of private proprietors only, and exclude all corporate or public property, or railways. Thus we see that a body which, allowing for double entries, does not probably exceed 4,500, owns more than half England. It must be remembered that the waste lands, which are set down at 1,524,264 acres, nearly all belong to lords of manors and large owners, who derive considerable profit from them from mines, rights of shooting, &c.; and, again, the plantations, which do not appear as a rule in these returns, amount to 1,450,000 acres in England and Wales, and are principally owned by large landowners or by the Crown.

However, without bringing these lands into consideration, we have this fact that, at least 17,500,000 acres of cultivated and rateable land of England, or 53 per cent., out of a total rateable area of 33,000,000 acres belongs to some 4,500 gentry.

The *Spectator*, in one of its interesting articles on this blue book, states that 43,000 owners own more than 100 acres. This would give us about 38,000 owners between 1,000 acres and 100. These, however, would include a good many corporations. I find in the first volume that there are 228 entries of railways owning 55,272 acres, of the rateable value of £3,143,170; doubling this for all England and Wales we should have about 450 entries of railways with rather



more than 110,000 acres and £6,000,000 rateable value. There are 149 entries in the two volumes of bishops, deans, and chapters, having a total of 90,000 acres, valued at £157,674 a year. The ecclesiastical commissioners are returned as owning 149,763 acres, worth £309,400, and figure in 50 counties. We shall probably be safe in assuming that throughout England 5 per cent. of the rated land is owned by corporations and public bodies, numbering 8 per cent. of all the owners of an acre and upwards, excluding those parish clergy who are entered as private owners.

The owners below one acre, 703,289 in number, have 149,102 acres, valued at £29,020,000, clearly showing that their holdings must be almost entirely house property; and probably nearly all these holdings are in the towns and villages, principally in the former. On the whole a considerable number of calculations lead to the following approximate results for all England. More than half is owned by private owners of 1,000 acres and upwards, about two-fifths is owned by middling owners from 100 to 1,000 acres, and only a tenth by owners of less than 100 acres.

But though the gentry own so large a portion of the soil of England, they by no means represent anything like one half of the value or income derived from real property. The total gross value of land, houses, railways, &c., was about £130,000,000 a year; from this we may deduct £30,000,000 for London and for tithes, and we have in round numbers £100,000,000, the value given in the return we are examining. But of this £29,000,000 is the value of house property held by owners of less than an acre; £6,000,000 is the value of the railways; there is a great deal to be set down to buildings covering more than an acre, such as large factories and workshops, and to collieries, iron works, &c., where much of the value belongs to the lessees. On the whole it is doubtful whether the 17,500,000 of land set down to the upper class of England yields £25,000,000 a year. No doubt there are other conspicuous sources of wealth to some of them; there are such great London estates as those of the Dukes of Westminster, Portland, and Bedford; there are the revenues derived from minerals, as in Lancashire by the Duke of Buccleuch, who only figures in this blue book for 370 acres and £450 a year in that county, or in Yorkshire by the Earl of Zetland who receives many thousands a year from the Cleveland ironstone which are unnoticed in the return. But though certain large properties strike the imagination, and though rumour is apt to magnify the wealth of rich men, yet it is most unlikely that from all these other sources, including invested personalty, the landed aristocracy and gentry have an additional income of more than £10,000,000 a year. When we compare this income of some £35,000,000 a year at the outside, with the wealth derived from real

property alone, to say nothing of the immense profits made yearly from trade, we see that in reality the dominant class of England does not owe its supremacy to its wealth, great and secure as that is, but to its prestige. It is the special attractiveness and honour and political importance that have been attached to the ownership of land which give the owners of large estates their influence. No doubt the ownership of large masses of the soil enables the possessors to force the industry of the nation to pay a heavy toll whenever it is sought to effect some great national improvement; the corporations of our great towns can most of them tell a tale of how the rates have been swollen by the heavy price they have had to pay to landowners for their water supply, for their drainage, for the disposal of their sewage; and the great railway companies, if they published the secret history of their negotiations with landowners, might make many an owner of an historic name and great estate blush at the revelations of the sources of some of his wealth. Occasionally a case has leaked out into publicity by the action of the law courts, but as a rule the knowledge of the prices paid to buy off opposition has gone no further than the gossip of railway directors and parliamentary agents, and of neighbouring squires who sighed that no corner of their land had been touched by the new railroad.

The power of the House of Lords is strikingly illustrated by this blue book. When we see the extent of their possessions we cannot wonder (especially when their territorial influence is coupled with the seductions of a title) that they should wield so much power even in these days of the ballot and of household suffrage.

The list of their possessions begins with estates of 191,000 acres, of 138,000 acres, and 108,000 acres, followed by 87,500 acres, 78,500 acres, 70,000 acres, 68,000 acres, 66,000 acres, and 61,000 acres.

There are nine peers having property between 50,000 and 60,000 acres, holding together 490,000 acres; five between 40,000 and 50,000, holding 216,000 acres; 23 between 30,000 and 40,000, owning 770,000 acres; 45 peers have estates between 20,000 and 30,000 acres, making an aggregate of 1,087,000 acres. From 20,000 to 15,000 acres there are 34 peers, and their estates amount to 564,000 acres. From 15,000 to 10,000 acres, there are 55 peers, and they own 674,000 acres; 72 peers own between 10,000 and 5,000 acres, in all 523,000 acres; and 81 peers own from 5,000 to 1,000 acres apiece, and together 230,000 acres. Thus 333 peers or peeresses own 5,422,000 acres, or one-sixth of the land of England.

This blue book does not show the position of those lands, nor set forth how great the political influence which they secure to their

possessors. But when we remember that it is from these great peers that the lords-lieutenant are chosen, on whom depends the nomination of county magistrates, when we remember the amount of patronage which they exercise outside of their own estates, the respect which their position insures in their own locality, we cannot be surprised at the immense political strength concentrated in the upper class; for 20,000 acres and £30,000 a year, when owned by a man of title, mean much more social prestige than the same property owned by a commoner, and infinitely more than three times the income made in trade, though the manufacturer who makes £100,000 a year may be employing and paying wages to more than the whole population on all the estates of the peer. And in estimating the power of the English aristocracy and gentry we must not forget what a potent auxiliary they have in the Church. In the first place, a very large amount of the patronage of the Church is in their hands; 1,351 livings are in their gift; and it is generally the large well-paid livings in country parishes with small populations, of which they have the disposal. They appoint their sons and brothers and relations, or if these are all provided for, then their personal friends and dependants; and the clergy, even if they were not prone as a profession to take a conservative view of things, have a very strong inducement in that direction on account of the way in which the mass of Church patronage is held in this country; and the bishops, promoted as they are by the prime ministers, are apt to fall into the same conservative groove, and they have the disposal of 2,029 livings, besides canonries and archdeaconries. What wonder, then, if the Established Church is found, with very few exceptions, throwing its weight in favour of the territorial party? And let it not be said that the territorial party is divided into Liberals and Conservatives. On mere political questions they may be divided, though even as to these the great mass of the class is conservative; but when we come to social questions—to matters in which the landowners' interest clashes with the general welfare—we become aware that class feeling is stronger to unite than political differences are to divide, as witness the legislation of eight years ago on the cattle plague, witness all questions connected with the taxation of land, or its settlement and inheritance. The system of primogeniture, of entail, and of settlement is kept up against the feeling of the mass of the middle and poorer classes of this country by the sentiment and family interest of those owners of estates of 1,000 acres and upwards, whose acreage is one-half, but whose interest as to the value of their property is not more than a quarter, of the whole income arising from real estate in the country. The agriculturists for years have demanded the same right of self-government and administration of local affairs that is enjoyed by the towns; but

the irresponsible oligarchy of Quarter Sessions goes on, because of the great political power of the gentry. If a borough wishes to have a court of Quarter Sessions it must pay for a recorder, who is nominated, like most other judges, by the Crown. Should the borough magistrates propose to sit themselves and try criminals at Quarter Sessions, such a proposal to introduce amateur justice would be scouted on all hands; but this same amateur administration of justice goes on in the county Quarter Sessions, with one or two exceptions, throughout England, and no one raises his voice in criticism. Nay, more, the chairman, who is elected by his brother magistrates to preside, is generally chosen from political motives; and no matter how good a lawyer a magistrate may be, no matter how diligent in discharging his duties, we may see him passed over, and we have seen such a man passed over, because the majority of the justices would not recognise merit in a political adversary.

And let no one suppose that the administration of the law by county justices has no bearing on the political importance of their class. Take one instance alone, and consider the immense power wielded by the justices in the granting of licenses to public-houses. Again, in the matter of music halls and places of entertainment, and in many other instances where licenses are required to carry on some trade, the good-will of the magistrates is all important, and the inhabitants of the country live in daily dread of incurring their displeasure. Again, these same justices in Quarter Sessions have the regulation of the rating of the county, and we know the scandal and bitter discontent that have been occasioned in many counties by the great disparity between the rated value of the great manor-house and that of the semi-detached villa of the retired tradesman. But we need not give detailed instances to show how the class of large landowners governs the country. In parliament and in their own districts their influence is paramount. The commercial classes have been able to secure free trade, and can obtain such special legislation as they need for their industrial purposes, but in general matters the landowners still govern the country.

Having given a general idea of the way in which land is held in England we must notice the Scotch returns. Of course it is not fair to lay the same stress on the size of estates there as in England, for a great deal of the land being waste and moor land must be held in large tracts to be made profitable for sheep farming; but after making all allowance for the barren character of a great part of Scotland, even so, the immense tracts that own the sway of one man are so inordinately large as seriously to injure the welfare of the country.

The following table gives the distribution of land in Scotland :—

		Acres.	
Duke and Duchess of Sutherland	1 . .	1,326,000	
Duke of Buccleuch . . .	1 . .	431,000	
Sir James Mattheson . . .	1 . .	424,000	
Earl of Breadalbane . . .	1 . .	373,000	
Earl of Seafield . . . .	1 . .	306,000	
Duke of Richmond . . . .	1 . .	269,000	
Earl of Fife . . . . .	1 . .	259,000	
Mr. Matheson . . . . .	1 . .	220,000	
Duke of Athole . . . . .	1 . .	195,000	
Duke of Argyll . . . . .	1 . .	174,000	
Sir K. Mackenzie . . . . .	1 . .	165,000	
Sir G. Ross . . . . .	1 . .	165,000	
Lord Lovat . . . . .	1 . .	162,000	
Duke of Hamilton . . . . .	1 . .	151,000	
McLeod . . . . .	1 . .	142,000	
Baily . . . . .	1 . .	141,000	
Earl of Dalhousie . . . . .	1 . .	138,000	
Lord Macdonald . . . . .	1 . .	130,000	
Cameron of Lochiel . . . . .	1 . .	126,000	
Macintosh . . . . .	1 . .	124,000	
Above . . . . .	100,000 acres . .	8 . .	836,000
From 100,000 to 50,000	„ . .	38 . .	2,504,000
„ 50,000 to 10,000	„ . .	264 . .	4,424,000
„ 10,000 to 9,000	„ . .	24 . .	224,600
„ 9,000 to 8,000	„ . .	37 . .	311,600
„ 8,000 to 7,000	„ . .	43 . .	316,400
„ 7,000 to 6,000	„ . .	59 . .	373,200
„ 6,000 to 5,000	„ . .	76 . .	410,500
„ 5,000 to 4,000	„ . .	119 . .	523,500
„ 4,000 to 3,000	„ . .	152 . .	477,500
„ 3,000 to 2,000	„ . .	290 . .	710,700
„ 2,000 to 1,000	„ . .	553 . .	791,000
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		1,683	17,324,000

The whole acreage of Scotland is returned in the Scotch land-owners' blue book as being 18,946,694 acres. Thus it results that more than nine-tenths of Scotland belong to less than 1,700 owners, and that half Scotland belongs to about seventy owners.

The blue book gives a total of 131,530 owners, but of these, 111,658 own less than an acre apiece, 35,000 being owners in towns of 20,000 inhabitants and upwards; there are less than 20,000 owners of an acre and upwards, of whom 1,316 are owners of land in the large towns.

And let it not be said that these large estates do no harm. For one thing the existence of these properties has made possible the creation of the great deer forests, which now occupy so large a portion of Scotland. We have no return of their acreage, but we shall probably be greatly within the mark if we say that 2,000,000 acres of land have been cleared of sheep and the valleys depopulated to

make room for deer. At 3 acres to a sheep, this means that some 700,000 sheep might be kept in Scotland, adding to the food supply of the country, and furnishing other valuable products, instead of which we have a few deer killed, and a number of gamekeepers, watchers, and gillies withdrawn from productive employments, to minister to the vulgar luxury of a few wealthy sportsmen. No doubt the Scotch lairds who let their land at a high rent, approve of the change, but it does not follow that the system of deer forests is good for the country. There is a transfer of wealth from the millionaire to the landlord, but the productiveness of the country is diminished, and though a great revenue is derived from the game rents, the State is defrauded, for these game rents are not valued for succession duty. Meantime, the small farmers who still exist in Highland glens find their oats trampled and devoured by the deer, who come down by night and browse and roll in their crops, and in winter they come even lower down and scrape up the potatoes, and make inroads on the food reserved for the stock of the farmers. A deer forest is not only a patch of barbarism in the midst of the country, but it inflicts injury beyond its bounds. Then the loneliness and quiet required for such a place leads landowners to obstruct and close existing rights of way. Anyone who has travelled about Scotland, knows how many paths formerly regularly used by shepherds, and much travelled over, are now being wrested from the public, who are not prepared to face the violence of gamekeepers who dispute their legal rights and drive them back from the hill. A sport which claims to shut up from public access miles of wild moor land where no possible injury can be done by men, stands condemned by that claim alone; especially at the present day, when the rage for enclosure, and the grasping at our commons, leaves so few spots of wild nature for us to seek refreshment in from the smoke and hideousness of modern industrial life.

The taste for the ownership of land is a natural one and a healthy one. The territorial democracy of which Mr. Disraeli once spoke is the backbone and strength of the United States. But there is a wide difference between the enjoyment of a Sabine fame, such as Horace delighted in, or the lordship of one lizard which Juvenal longed for, and those *latifundia* which ruined Italy and caused the fall of the Roman Empire. The great estates in flying over which a hawk would grow weary, the rhetorical image of the Roman poet, are almost realised at the present day within the narrow limits of this little island. Tracts which would be over wide if planted in the boundless prairies of the West, cramp and jostle us among the factories and workshops of our great industrial populations. Close by the courts and alleys of our crowded towns we see mile upon mile of park palings which enclose some rural paradise of wood and water, of glade and thorny thicket,

of fern and smooth turf lawns. The two seem designed to supplement each other. But the mechanic as he tramps along the dusty road passes by locked lodges and suspicious gamekeepers, who warn him that there is no pleasure for him within the walls. That trespassers will be prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law, is the notice that stares him in the face. The great park is reserved for the solitary owner and for the game. It was said of our English nobility and their great dreary parks, "*Solitudinem faciunt, placem appellunt.*" Is it desirable to keep up by artificial legislation these great estates which minister to pomp and to political importance, but not to real happiness? When a landowner has so much land that he does not know, as he goes over it, whether it belongs to him or to another; when his tenants know nothing of him, but through the estate agent and solicitor, how is he the better for this dominion? No doubt the power to return himself or his son for the county ministers to his political importance. He can out of these vast domains secure a peerage or a rise in the peerage or a blue, or a red, or a green ribbon. But after all, these objects of ambition are in themselves artificial, the result of a diseased state of society in which, where luxury is gratified to the full, imaginary wants have to be invented to furnish some further object of hope, lest life should pall from satiety. And when we come lower down in the social scale, to the gentry of moderate estates, we find other evil results from the superstitious reverence that is paid to the quality of squire. The owner of two or three thousand acres is weighed down by his position—he has inherited with the family estate and the family mortgages, a family mansion beyond his means to keep up, and a family position which he maintains by scraping and saving, and by pinching himself and his family. Popular speech calls him the owner; but though as much is expected of him as if he were truly the owner, yet in reality he is a mere life tenant with little power and sadly hampered. The real owners among whom the income of the property is distributed are legion. There are the mortgagees, the dowager with her jointure, the brothers or sisters and their children with their charges on the land, the married son on whom he has made a settlement to induce him to re-entail the property. There are the claims of the squire's station, as imperious though not as legal as the others. Then there is the need of saving out of the scanty life income to provide for the younger children. When all these drains have been considered, how little is there left for the improvement of the property. "*Quicquid delirant reges*" may be translated freely, if the squire contests an election, or if the squire's son incurs gambling debts, it is the cottagers who must pay, in broken-down hovels, in an undrained and fever-stricken village, in a poisoned water supply fed from neighbouring cesspools. But in spite of all these

drawbacks, family pride requires that the family of Acres shall still be known as Acres of Clod Hall. The loss of dignity which would result from severance from those rushy, ill-drained, bankrupt acres, is worse than all the pinching and anxiety that are endured with their possession. And this nourishment of family pride at the expense of family feeling and of the welfare of the country, becomes a sort of religion which is inculcated upon all the children, whether the one happy eldest born, who is to transmit the family glory undimmed, or the younger ones to whom is reserved the less pleasant duty of self-sacrifice. Fortunately at the present day the younger sons have taken more boldly to various trades and professions, and we have comparatively few of those undesirable characters which figure in the plays and novels of the last century, such as the Squire's younger brother who hung about the hall, and in return for his board and lodging discharged the duties of a superior gamekeeper. The family living still often provides for one son, who, nolens volens, must profess a divine call to accept the position of rector with some hundreds a year. But official patronage and maintenance at the expense of the State being gone, except for the few who are highly connected, most of the younger sons of the gentry set out manfully to fight their way in life. But how does the system work on the daughters? We are astonished at the willingness of widows in India to burn in obedience to custom, but England is full of starving spinsters who have lost the chance of happy homes, because the glory of the family demanded that the money which might have enabled them to marry, should be retained to enable the son and heir to keep up his position in the country. And these faded women, many of them, do not repine. They treasure the memory of some old romance, the novel of their life, of which the third volume has been suppressed, but console themselves for the loss by feeding their family pride and keeping up a chill gentility, which would be ludicrous if it were not pathetic.

The welfare of the country demands that land should be freely bought and sold. Fully one half of the land is strictly tied up in settlement, so that it is not in the market. The tradition of family pride and social importance, which are coupled with the ownership of land, help to keep it out. When property in land no longer confers an advantage in local government there will not be the same inducement to amass great properties; land will be held by rich men in such portions as are necessary for enjoyment, not for domination or vainglory. In such a case there would gradually be few estates in the cultivated parts of the country of more than a thousand acres, and this would not work any social oppression, especially if we had better and larger units of rural self-government than the township or small parish. With a unit of self-government such as the poor



of fern and smooth turf lawns. The two seem designed to supplement each other. But the mechanic as he tramps along the dusty road passes by locked lodges and suspicious gamekeepers, who warn him that there is no pleasure for him within the walls. That trespassers will be prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law, is the notice that stares him in the face. The great park is reserved for the solitary owner and for the game. It was said of our English nobility and their great dreary parks, "*Solitudinem faciunt, placem appellant.*" Is it desirable to keep up by artificial legislation these great estates which minister to pomp and to political importance, but not to real happiness? When a landowner has so much land that he does not know, as he goes over it, whether it belongs to him or to another; when his tenants know nothing of him, but through the estate agent and solicitor, how is he the better for this dominion? No doubt the power to return himself or his son for the county ministers to his political importance. He can out of these vast domains secure a peerage or a rise in the peerage or a blue, or a red, or a green ribbon. But after all, these objects of ambition are in themselves artificial, the result of a diseased state of society in which, where luxury is gratified to the full, imaginary wants have to be invented to furnish some further object of hope, lest life should pall from satiety. And when we come lower down in the social scale, to the gentry of moderate estates, we find other evil results from the superstitious reverence that is paid to the quality of squire. The owner of two or three thousand acres is weighed down by his position—he has inherited with the family estate and the family mortgages, a family mansion beyond his means to keep up, and a family position which he maintains by scraping and saving, and by pinching himself and his family. Popular speech calls him the owner; but though as much is expected of him as if he were truly the owner, yet in reality he is a mere life tenant with little power and sadly hampered. The real owners among whom the income of the property is distributed are legion. There are the mortgagees, the dowager with her jointure, the brothers or sisters and their children with their charges on the land, the married son on whom he has made a settlement to induce him to re-entail the property. There are the claims of the squire's station, as imperious though not as legal as the others. Then there is the need of saving out of the scanty life income to provide for the younger children. When all these drains have been considered, how little is there left for the improvement of the property. "*Quicquid delirant reges*" may be translated freely, if the squire contests an election, or if the squire's son incurs gambling debts, it is the cottagers who must pay, in broken-down hovels, in an undrained and fever-stricken village, in a poisoned water supply fed from neighbouring cesspools. But in spite of all these

drawbacks, family pride requires that the family of Acres shall still be known as Acres of Clod Hall. The loss of dignity which would result from severance from those rushy, ill-drained, bankrupt acres, is worse than all the pinching and anxiety that are endured with their possession. And this nourishment of family pride at the expense of family feeling and of the welfare of the country, becomes a sort of religion which is inculcated upon all the children, whether the one happy eldest 'born, who is to transmit the family glory undimmed, or the younger ones to whom is reserved the less pleasant duty of self-sacrifice. Fortunately at the present day the younger sons have taken more boldly to various trades and professions, and we have comparatively few of those undesirable characters which figure in the plays and novels of the last century, such as the Squire's younger brother who hung about the hall, and in return for his board and lodging discharged the duties of a superior gamekeeper. The family living still often provides for one son, who, nolens volens, must profess a divine call to accept the position of rector with some hundreds a year. But official patronage and maintenance at the expense of the State being gone, except for the few who are highly connected, most of the younger sons of the gentry set out manfully to fight their way in life. But how does the system work on the daughters? We are astonished at the willingness of widows in India to burn in obedience to custom, but England is full of starving spinsters who have lost the chance of happy homes, because the glory of the family demanded that the money which might have enabled them to marry, should be retained to enable the son and heir to keep up his position in the country. And these faded women, many of them, do not repine. They treasure the memory of some old romance, the novel of their life, of which the third volume has been suppressed, but console themselves for the loss by feeding their family pride and keeping up a chill gentility, which would be ludicrous if it were not pathetic.

The welfare of the country demands that land should be freely bought and sold. Fully one half of the land is strictly tied up in settlement, so that it is not in the market. The tradition of family pride and social importance, which are coupled with the ownership of land, help to keep it out. When property in land no longer confers an advantage in local government there will not be the same inducement to amass great properties; land will be held by rich men in such portions as are necessary for enjoyment, not for domination or vainglory. In such a case there would gradually be few estates in the cultivated parts of the country of more than a thousand acres, and this would not work any social oppression, especially if we had better and larger units of rural self-government than the township or small parish. With a unit of self-government such as the poor

law union, and with a unit for election of representatives of not less than 1,000 inhabitants, much of the political importance of the ownership of the land of a parish would disappear, and economic considerations which tend to the distribution of land would come into play. It is desirable that even in rural districts land may be so distributed that the competition of landowners may come into play, and that in no district any one man should have a veto on the existence of places of worship or of schools. It is further desirable that land should be held by solvent people, who can improve it and do justice to it, instead of the present state of things, where many a bankrupt and broken-down family clings to a property that belongs far more to the mortgagees than to them.

It is desirable that there should be greater power for the acquisition of small freeholds, that in our villages, mechanics and others who are industrious should be able to acquire the independence resulting from the ownership of the houses in which they dwell. It is the precarious tenure of their homes, which to a great extent puts the poorer classes in the country at the mercy of the upper class.

Valuable as the old yeomanry cultivating their own land was, and much as it is to be regretted that such a class should have passed away or nearly so, it is not easy to look for the founding anew of such a class. Improved methods of agriculture, the demand for more capital per acre in the cultivation of land, the tendency to make farming a skilled and scientific occupation, and the growth of large farms, are all against a revival of the old class of yeomanry. But we may give our tenant farmers many of the characteristics of that class. Security for their capital by some reasonable tenant right, compensation for improvements, protection from the ravages of game, association in the government of the county, education for their children in reformed grammar schools, all these things will give them strength, dignity, and security, and will raise their status, and create in them some of that outspoken independence which was the boast and pride of our old yeomanry. If at the same time by the proper use of our waste lands and public lands, facilities are given to the labourers to advance their position, either by allotments or by co-operative farming, and if our rural elementary schools are made truly national and efficient, and if a proper self-governing organization be given to rural England, we may see a peaceful revolution for the better which will work wonders. As relates to the distribution of land, a few changes in the law would probably do much.

1. The separation of county administration from the ownership of land, the basing it on an elective ground, and the readjustment and extension of areas for local government.

2. The assimilation in all respects of real to personal property.

3. The prohibition of settlements of land on unborn persons, and

the incorporation of a power of sale in all settlements without requiring any consents.

4. The extension of the powers of compulsory purchase of land for many public objects.

5. The abolition of the game laws, or at least their very great restriction.

Of all the questions which demand the attention of Liberal politicians, there is none that cries more loudly for settlement than this one of the relation of the people of England to the land of England. The connection between Church and State interests a more active group of reformers, and is, therefore, discussed more frequently, but it is not in more urgent, nor in as urgent, need of reform.

Though the land laws of this country hamper its social development, though they inflict a grievous tax upon the whole nation for the benefit of a small class, though they have degraded the poor of the country, and stunted the health of our town population; yet in spite of all this, apart from some speculative Radicals of the upper or middle class, few reformers outside of the working-class leaders have sought to expose their injustice, and to bring about a remedy. Many times have Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright sought to direct attention to this matter, as one which would, if thoroughly dealt with, produce a greater harvest of good to the country than even the repeal of the corn laws; but their call has met with no response. When Mr. Mill founded the Land Tenure Reform Association, his own name and personal eminence supported it for a time; but even during his lifetime few subscribers came forward, and after his death the society collapsed.

Nevertheless, though in the present age of feverish accumulation of wealth, of craving for social distinction, of somewhat easier transition than formerly from the middle to the upper class, the temptation is very great to our successful men of business to ally themselves with the system which maintains the social supremacy of large landowners, and though consequently the natural leaders of the movement for land reform fail us, yet we cannot doubt that as education spreads among the poor, as municipal and representative institutions are extended and strengthened, we shall make the land laws of England one of the practical questions for politicians, instead of a speculative theme for economists.

E. LYULPH STANLEY.

## THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN AMERICA.

It is a humiliating reflection that the Anglo-Saxon race are unable to subsist through a whole generation without two or three times breaking into a commercial and financial stampede, in which, figuratively speaking, hundreds of thousands of people are trampled to death, or left bruised and bleeding by the way side. These disgraceful routs have latterly assumed something of the regularity of clock-work, so that people pretend to know when to expect one by looking in the almanac. 1816, 1825, 1837, 1847, 1857, 1866, 1873, each of these years has ushered in its holocaust of English victims, and the alternate periods have included America as well, so that business men take into their calculations a panic on one side of the water every ten years, and on the other side every twenty. But, notwithstanding the apparent regularity of the visitation, very few men engaged in trade escape, when the clock strikes the dreadful hour. The appearance of prosperity immediately preceding the panic is so deceitful, the activity of trade and the upward movement of prices are so exhilarating, that the tornado always finds us with every inch of canvas spread, all the ports open, and the crew fast asleep. It is impossible to exaggerate the suffering caused by these financial storms, whose vengeance always falls with greatest severity upon those least responsible for them, and least able to resist them, —the labouring poor. No one can read the story of England's poor immediately following the commercial crises of 1816 and 1825 without a shudder. Nor were those of America, after the crises of 1837 and 1857, any better provided for, except as nature had dealt rather more kindly by them. All that man could do had been done to turn them shelterless and penniless into the street, to become beggars or barbarians, like the Sunderland sailors, the Norwich weavers, and the Bradford wool-combers of the mother-country. Few persons are aware how great an obstacle to human progress these oft-recurring shocks to industry really are. We see great houses go down with a crash, but others come to take their places. We see multitudes of operatives thrown out of employment, and soup kitchens established, and charities set on foot, to carry them through the weary time of revulsion. What is not seen is the progress they might make if their savings were not swept away every few years through no fault of their own.

The people of the United States are now toiling through one of these periodical crises. During the past three years there have been mercantile failures with liabilities reaching nearly \$650,000,000. Multitudes of persons have been plunged from affluence into poverty.

Greater multitudes have been thrown out of employment altogether. Riotous demonstrations have taken place among the cotton operatives at Fall River, in the coal regions of Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, but happily without bloodshed. The New England States are pinched almost to the extremity of endurance, and the iron industry is prostrated as it has never before been in the lifetime of the writer. The West has suffered less than any other section, but the whole country is in a sad state of trouble, and is asking, When will these hard times pass away?

The phenomena antecedent to the crisis were the usual ones—a rise of prices, great prosperity, large profits, high wages and strikes for higher, crowded thoroughfares, large importations, a railway mania, expanded credits, over-trading, over-building, and high living. On the 17th of September, 1873, the New York and Oswego Midland Railway Company failed, and there was a tremor in the stock market. On the 18th the banking house of Jay Cooke and Co. closed its doors, and the depression in stocks became a panic. Prices of the leading railway and miscellaneous shares fell from 1 to 10 per cent. The usual soothing statements were put forth that the suspension would be only temporary, but the public believed otherwise. This firm had been long engaged in promoting the most hazardous and premature railway enterprise of the age, viz., the Northern Pacific, and had made advances of its own and its depositors' money to the amount of several millions. Its position was identical with that of the financial companies that collapsed in London in 1866—its capital and deposits having been lost in bad speculations. On the 19th the firm of Fisk and Hatch succumbed, together with eighteen other private banking and brokerage houses, in New York. Messrs. Fisk and Hatch had been "carrying" the Chesapeake and Ohio railway in much the same way that Cooke and Co. had been carrying the Northern Pacific, but they possessed the confidence of business men in a higher degree. There were eight failures in Philadelphia on the same day, and a "run" was commenced on the Union Trust Company of New York, one of the largest monetary establishments in the city. On the 20th the Union Trust Company closed its doors, with liabilities amounting to \$6,000,000, and it became speedily known that its secretary was a defaulter to the amount of \$128,000, and that an outside person had been allowed to make an overdraft of \$200,000 more. Subsequent investigation showed that the Union Trust Company was full of dead men's bones. Panic terror now seized Wall Street. Western Union Telegraph shares, the leading fancy in the market then, as now, fell from  $90\frac{1}{4}$  (the price it commanded four days earlier) to  $55\frac{1}{2}$ , and New York Central Railway, the *pièce de résistance* of the Stock Exchange, from 100 to 89. The Bank of the Commonwealth and the National

Trust Company suspended, and so many stock-brokers were believed to be unable to meet their engagements that the Stock Exchange was closed by order of its officers, and remained closed ten days.

On the 22nd there was a general agreement that the worst was over, the only failure of importance being that of the Canada Southern Railway Company; but, to guard against a return of the symptoms, the aid of the Government was invoked, and an order was obtained from the President to turn the contents of the national treasury into the money market by purchasing Government bonds with Government legal-tender notes. No advantage whatever resulted from the action of the Government, for the reason that the holders of the national bonds were not generally the persons needing money, and no others could gain access to the supply in the treasury. The New York savings' banks, however, were large holders of bonds, and, apprehending a run upon themselves, they rushed headlong to get them converted into greenbacks, which they immediately put under lock and key. The savings' banks were protected against runs by a provision of law which authorises them to require thirty or sixty days' notice from depositors of an intention to draw out their money. Before the expiration of this period the panic had subsided, and the managers found that they had exchanged an interest-bearing security for another bearing no interest. They had sold their bonds at panic prices, and must buy them back at an advance, if at all; but what is to the purpose now is that the greenbacks poured out of the Government vaults went straightway into the savings' bank vaults, and produced no effect whatever on the money market. It may be added that if they had not gone into the hands of the savings' bank managers they would probably have remained in the Government vaults.

On the 23rd the bad symptoms returned. The banking-house of Henry Clews and Company suspended. This was a house that had close and somewhat questionable relations with the Government at Washington. The drain upon the New York banks for currency had now become so severe that the regular operation of the clearing-house was no longer possible; and it was determined to issue \$10,000,000 of certificates based upon bills receivable of the banks, to be used for paying balances at the clearing-house instead of legal-tender notes. These certificates were issued by a clearing-house committee, who passed judgment upon the bills receivable, and required a margin of 25 per cent. to make good any probable depreciation resulting from mercantile failures. I am not aware that this device was ever before resorted to as a means of ballasting commerce against the temporary effects of a panic. It certainly merits the attention of economists; for although it amounted, in a legal point of view, to a general bank suspension, it checked the prevailing

terror in a notable manner. Instead of a dozen or more of the weaker banks, and perhaps all of them eventually, being closed up, with the possibility of having their affairs settled through the courts of law, the stronger ones sustained the weaker; and, what is more to the point, their united action exercised a moral force on the community which effectually prevented a run, or any extreme measures to compel the immediate payment of deposits by legal proceedings.

As a corollary to this action, the banks, on the 24th, ceased paying large cheques at their counters, but certified them "good through the clearing-house." Cheques for small sums were paid as usual. Larger ones were paid, if required by manufacturers or others to pay wages to operatives. Certified cheques and clearing-house certificates fell to 1 per cent. discount, and became a marketable commodity. The total amount of clearing-house certificates rose, during the period of suspension, to \$22,000,000, from which point it gradually sank until the 1st of November, when they were all redeemed and resumption took place.

On the 25th, the Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Cincinnati, and St. Louis banks followed the example of the New York banks, *i.e.* suspended the payment of currency on large cheques, issued clearing-house certificates for bank balances, and expostulated with their customers, instead of either paying them or closing their doors. Within a few days this policy had been adopted in nearly every town in the United States where three or more banks existed, a clearing-house being extemporised for the occasion. In Chicago a different policy was pursued. That city was very favourably situated for drawing currency from the west. The panic had come in the midst of the crop-moving season. Chicago, being the principal centre of the grain trade, was in a position to command currency in spite of the utmost efforts of eastern cities to retain and hoard it, and accordingly it began to flow thither very rapidly, first at the rate of \$1,000,000, and gradually rising to \$3,500,000 per day, to pay for grain. The principal banks of that city believed that they could respond to any run that would probably be made upon them, and refused to enter into any arrangement for paying or receiving balances from each other in clearing-house promises. There was accordingly a run in Chicago, and five banks suspended. Three of those were perfectly solvent, and soon resumed business.

On the 26th, currency attained a premium of 3 to 5 per cent. over certified bank cheques in New York, but the premium of gold over currency was declining. During all this time there was absolutely no quotable rate of interest anywhere, but time transactions in grain at Chicago showed that some traders were willing to pay at the rate of 20 per cent. per month, and that they could be accommodated at that rate. - It is probable that some loans were made, even in the



height of the panic, at moderate rates of interest, as a matter of favour, or in order to protect security which would otherwise have been lost altogether; but such transactions cannot be adduced to show any such thing as a market rate for the use of money. In fact, there was no market rate.

On the 29th reports came from the manufacturing districts that employers were discharging their operatives, or putting them on half time. Several mercantile failures were announced in Philadelphia, and the Glenham Manufacturing Company, a large woollen establishment, suspended. The mere panic terror had now so far spent itself that the New York Stock Exchange ventured to reopen its doors on the 30th.

The remaining events of the forty-day period, which commenced on the 17th of September, may be briefly narrated. On the 2nd of October the premium of currency as compared with certified cheques had fallen to 1 per cent., and soon after it declined to  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and then to  $\frac{1}{8}$ , and on the 31st it disappeared entirely. Mercantile failures became more numerous, and reports of manufacturing distress multiplied. On the 10th of October a series of remarkable ups and downs in the Stock Exchange commenced, showing that large holders, who were not yet broken, were making desperate efforts to restore prices to something near the old figures. Fluctuations of 10 per cent. in a single day in some classes of securities were not uncommon. Some failures took place among these operators more important than any that had been announced in September. The banks throughout the country had generally retired their clearing-house certificates, and being no longer threatened with a run for deposits, found no difficulty in meeting all demands made upon them for currency. But the crisis was ploughing a deep furrow through the mercantile, manufacturing, and railway interests, and through all branches of speculation. There had been a fall in the prices of nearly all commodities except grain, which was sustained by an active foreign demand. On the 31st the paper of a large Rhode Island manufacturing firm, employing nearly two million spindles, went to protest. The liabilities were said to be \$14,000,000, and the assets much larger in amount, but among these assets was a most extraordinary collection of investments for cotton spinning and print works, embracing water-power in Maine, and also in South Carolina, lands in Kansas, sheet-iron works, steamships, street railways, locomotive works, saw mills, flax mills, savings banks, and race courses. This was the largest mercantile failure of the year. The price of gold (payable in greenbacks) had been quite steady at 111 to 113 before the panic. It sank slowly to 106  $\frac{1}{8}$  on the 7th of November (the lowest since the war), from which point it rose to 110  $\frac{1}{2}$  in December. That is to say, greenbacks had been worth about 90 cents to the dollar before the panic, rose to 94 during the panic,

and declined to about 90 after it. United States Five per Cent. Bonds, which stood at 114½ in July, fell to 106 in September, to 105 in October and November, and rose to 113 in December. The other classes of national securities showed about the same fluctuations.

The following table shows the mercantile failures in the United States for a period of five years and three months : <sup>1</sup>

Year.	Number of Failures.	Liabilities.	Average Liabilities to each Failure.
		<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1871	2,915	85,252,000	29,245
1872	4,069	121,056,000	29,996
1873	5,183	228,449,000	44,045
1874	5,830	155,233,000	26,627
1875	7,740	201,060,000	25,960
1876 <sup>2</sup>	2,806	64,000,000	22,808

Railway bonds in default at the beginning of the present year amounted to \$789,367,665, of which \$535,967,665 were held in the United States, and \$253,400,000 abroad. Of this sum, \$226,425,100 were in default prior to September 20, 1873.<sup>3</sup>

The causes and antecedents of this crisis were of like nature with those of all previous financial crises, from the great tulip speculation in Holland, in 1636, down to the present time—viz., a great multiplication of debts based upon a relatively small amount of capital. Some writers have endeavoured to draw a distinction between a financial crisis and a commercial crisis. Indeed, it is doubtful whether any crisis of the kind we are considering has ever taken place anywhere without finding plenty of people, of more or less repute, to call it a financial and not a commercial crisis, implying thereby that it was a popular misunderstanding respecting money, and not a real deficiency of the means of payment. There is no room for such a distinction. The yardsticks, the scales, and the peck measures never produced any crisis, nor is it in their nature to produce one. No more is it in the nature of that other tool for facilitating the exchange of property called money. The financial crisis and the commercial crisis are two names for the same thing. What that thing is it is the aim of this article to inquire. A distinction is perfectly allowable, however, and even necessary, between a crisis produced by internal, and one produced by external, causes. The real financial crisis is the one which has wrought itself out by purely

(1) These figures are from the annual reports of the Mercantile Agency of R. G. Dun, and Co., who have on their books the names of 680,000 individuals and firms. They do not report failures of banks, brokers, real estate dealers, railway companies, or persons not engaged in mercantile business or closely allied trades.

(2) Three months.

(3) *Financial Review*, William B. Dana and Co., New York.

commercial events. A crisis caused by political revolution, like that in France in 1848, belongs to a different category. The migration or hiding of capital to escape the apprehended dangers of communism, or invasion, or any other form of public disorder, may lead to extensive bank failures, and these may lead to mercantile failures, the whole assuming the appearance of a financial crisis, but it is not the phenomenon we are now considering.

The war of the rebellion closed in the spring of 1865, having demonstrated not merely the tenacity of the combatants on both sides, but stupendous powers of production. It is probably no exaggeration to say that the expenditure of the two sections during the four years, after making due allowance for the use of a depreciated currency, exceeded 4,000 millions of dollars gold value, or a sum equal to the whole debt of Great Britain. Of this sum, not more than one-tenth, if so much, was borrowed from abroad while the war was in progress. The capability of producing a surplus of two hundred millions sterling per year was as little suspected by the people of the United States themselves as by those of other countries; and when we consider that a million men were constantly withdrawn from productive employment—the number rising much above that at times—we cannot fail to perceive how rapid would be the increase of wealth if the labour, the natural resources, and the machinery of the country could be called into as great activity in time of peace as in war. The phenomenon of great prosperity, coincident with the waste and destruction of property by war, is easily explained when we consider how small a share of the potential energy of the people ordinarily finds employment.

The country was fairly prosperous during the four years succeeding the war, and at the expiration of this time there was much capital seeking investment in America, and still more in Europe. In 1869 the Pacific railway was opened and the country seemed to accept that event as a signal for general speculation. Prices of real estate rose in the chief cities with great rapidity. Immigration was pouring in fast, under the pressure of inexorable military service and the danger of war in Europe. To take advantage of this increase of population a number of large railway land-grants were pressed upon Congress, and passed, and others that had lain dormant for years were actively entered upon.<sup>1</sup> An unexampled railway mania sprang up. The market for American securities in England, Germany, and Holland became very active, so active, indeed, that the ordinary rules of prudence were entirely cast aside

(1) The whole number of acres, good and bad, available under old and new grants, was 170,208,000, three-fourths of which was offered to the various Pacific railways—the largest grant being to the Northern Pacific, 47,000,000 acres. Grants to the amount of 6,360,000 acres have been forfeited and not renewed.

by the investors. Rascals on both sides of the water hastened to put their sickles into this bounteous harvest. Schemes and prospectuses were sowed broadcast over Germany that no American would put a dollar in, and were greedily taken up.<sup>1</sup> Others, that Germany and England rejected, were eagerly taken by Americans, and in the end both sorts went to perdition together. Town and county bonds in aid of railways were voted by populations by wholesale. There was a great speculation in iron. Prices rose rapidly, and mills and furnaces were multiplied. The average increment of railway mileage in the country from 1859 to 1869 had been under 2,000 miles per year. In 1869 it rose to 4,953 miles; in 1870, to 5,690 miles; in 1871, to 7,670 miles. In 1872, the market for railway bonds both at home and abroad showed signs of glut, and the railway increment for the year fell back to 6,167 miles, in 1873 to 3,948 miles, and in 1874 to 1,940 miles. Meanwhile, general speculation spread on all sides. Imports and exports increased rapidly. The loans and discounts of the banks mounted up six times faster than the deposits. The loan market had been extremely capricious for a year or two before the panic, but there was an average rise in the rate of interest, culminating in the autumn of 1872, from which period it gradually fell till the spring of 1873, when it again commenced rising, and continued rising till September, when it went out of sight completely. The usury law, which still remains in force in the chief commercial city, and in nearly all the States, renders it difficult to obtain the exact rates of interest, since banks and other moneyed corporations are compelled to square their transactions, ostensibly at least, by the legal rate (7 per cent. in New York). The rates are of two kinds: 1, for short date commercial paper; 2, for call loans, on collateral security. In a normal condition of the money market the rates for call loans are 2 to 3 per cent. below the commercial rate, but in a period of

(1) Take, for example, the Rockford, Rock Island and St. Louis railway. Bonds to the amount of \$9,000,000, in this superfluous and ridiculous enterprise, were sold at something near par, principally in Germany. They afterwards declined to 6 cents per dollar. Some litigation which took place last year, over this property, disclosed the fact that the two firms of Budge, Schiff, and Co., of New York, and Moritz Budge, of Frankfurt-on-the-Main, pocketed \$1,427,423 for their exertions in selling these insecurities to their countrymen. After other means of squeezing the property and the bondholders had been exhausted, resort was had to speculating in gold with the funds in the treasury. Mr. Boody, the treasurer, testified that Budge and Co. claimed that they had lost \$100,000 in one such operation, and \$44,000 in another, and that they demanded to be reimbursed from the funds of the company. "I asked them at the time," says Mr. Boody, "for a statement—the parties from whom they had bought gold, the amount purchased from each; they declined to give it. Subsequently in writing I demanded the information, and in writing they refused to give it, but the loss was incurred, and charged to the company.

*Question.* Is that included in this amount?

*Answer.* Yes; I never believed there was any gold bought or any gold sold."

great stringency, like the autumn of 1872, they rise much higher than the commercial rate. This apparent anomaly is probably accounted for by the fact that in the time of stringency loans on commercial paper are largely a matter of favouritism, whereas call loans for carrying stocks are governed by the strict rules of supply and demand. The *Financial Review* says, "For two years prior to the financial crisis of 1873 the money market had worked with extraordinary closeness, the rates paid on call loans occasionally reaching  $\frac{1}{4}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  of 1 per cent. per diem, in addition to the legal rate of 7 per cent. per annum. The remarkable stringency in money arose from the immense demand which sprang up from new railway enterprises, and also to supply the general speculative operations which had been fostered by the issues of paper money, and which went on until checked by the monetary pressure that reached a climax in the panic of 1873. During 1874 money was unusually easy." I shall be compelled to dissent from the opinion here expressed, that the speculative operations were fostered in any peculiar sense by the issues of paper money. The *Review* then gives the rates of interest on commercial paper for a series of years, from which the following are selected:—

Year.	January.	May.	July.	September.	November.
1872	8 to 10	7 to 8	6 to 7	10 to 12	12
1873	9 to 12	5 to 7	6 to 7	—	12 to 18
1874, average for whole year					6
1875	"	"			5½

The next exhibit of importance in the present investigation is the statistics of bank deposits and bank loans. The returns are for the month of October in each year except 1873, which are for September 12:—

DEPOSITS AND LOANS AND DISCOUNTS OF THE NATIONAL BANKS OF THE UNITED STATES IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.
Deposits . . . . .	579	511	507	600	613	622
Loans and discounts	657	682	712	827	872	940

DEPOSITS AND LOANS AND DISCOUNTS OF THE NATIONAL BANKS OF NEW YORK CITY.

	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.
Individual deposits .	136	127	141	117	111
Loans and discounts .	168	168	198	175	199

The reader will observe the comparative steadiness of bank deposits in the country at large during the whole period, and the rapid expansion of loans and discounts, especially the increase of twenty-four millions in New York city from 1872 to 1873 on an actual decrease of deposits. The expansion of bank loans is a noted phenomenon of periods antecedent to commercial crises, so much so that one might almost venture to estimate the nearness of a crisis by comparing the tables of different periods. This increase of bank loans, as I shall show hereafter, is a consequence and not a cause of the state of commercial activity which ends in panic and crash.

It has already been remarked that the antecedents of the American crisis of 1873 were identical in their nature with every other commercial crisis of which any account can be found, viz., speculation, or the act of buying with a view to selling at a higher price, and over-trading, or the act of buying and selling too much on a given capital. Most commonly these two elements are accompanied by two others, namely, the destruction or loss of previously accumulated capital, and the rapid conversion of circulating into fixed capital. Speculation and destruction of capital usually go together in preparing the way for a crisis. Speculation may bring on a crisis without the destruction of capital. If people go in debt to each other for tulip bulbs at a thousand florins each, as the Dutch did in the seventeenth century, and tulips suddenly fall in the market, it will be found that the debts remain a fixed sum while the assets have shrunk to a much less value, and a crisis will be the result, a crisis of more or less intensity according to the number of persons and interests involved, directly and indirectly, in the traffic. The tulips will remain in the community, and their utility in people's gardens will be as great as ever. Consequently there may be no resulting loss of capital, though a great many people may be ruined. There may be a very extensive and unsatisfactory transfer of property among different members of the community without any loss in the aggregate. I say this may happen, but what almost always does happen is that there is an aggregate loss resulting from the bad investment of capital during the speculative period.

The element of credit is an essential ingredient of a financial crisis. However great the destruction of capital may be at any time, there can be no such thing as a revulsion if nobody is in debt. There may be a famine, but there can be no crisis if nobody owes more than he can pay. There may be hard times and great scarcity resulting from war, fires, floods, bad harvests, and other calamities, but without the relation of debtor and creditor there will be no financial crisis. It may happen that at a time when the business of a country is on a really sound basis some unforeseen event, or some unobserved train of circumstances, may sweep off so much capital in so short a space of time that existing debts cannot be paid with what is left. I cannot

recall any case where this has been the sole cause. The English crisis of 1847 was undoubtedly greatly aggravated and perhaps precipitated by the failure of the potato crop in Ireland, and the absorption of a large amount of capital in railway construction, but it was set on foot by heavy speculations during the two preceding years, and the bankruptcies actually began among the grain speculators. Even in such a case as this the debts are the essential element of the crisis.

I therefore offer this definition. A financial crisis consists of an undue accumulation of debts based upon exaggerated and fanciful ideas of the value of property, usually accompanied by the destruction and loss of capital, and the rapid conversion of circulating into fixed capital.

Acquaintance with the fundamental principles of currency and exchange is presumed in the readers of this Review. Only such reference will be made to them in the present discussion, as may be necessary to preserve continuity of argument. All trade is at bottom barter. Property and services are really exchanged for each other. Money, currency, bank notes, cheques, bills of exchange and clearing houses are different instruments, or tools, for facilitating the exchange of property with the greatest amount of exactitude and the least amount of friction. All exchanges are made, however, and all contracts must be settled, in terms of the pound sterling, the dollar, the franc, or whatever may be the money of the country. Bank deposits consist, for the most part, of written evidences of ownership, or title-deeds, of the circulating capital of the country—the wheat, cotton, cattle, iron, yarn, sugar, coal, linen, and other property in transit between producer and consumer, whether the producers and consumers be in the same country or in different countries. The proportion which currency (bank notes, government notes and gold) bears to drafts, cheques, and bills of exchange (representing property in transit), varies according to the density of population and the habits of the people. In Anglo-Saxon countries it may be said to vary according to density of population only. In London, the drafts, cheques, &c., are about 97 per cent. of the bank deposits; in New York about 90; in Chicago about 80. A bank deposit usually represents a sale of property, the proceeds of which the bank undertakes to collect, and if the depositor is in good standing, the amount is immediately placed to his credit. A bank cheque usually represents a purchase; and the various sales and purchases are offset against each other at the clearing houses, and the balances paid in the legal tender of the country.

Now all the debts in the country have to be paid out of its circulating capital, and if any process is going on whereby the aggregate of debt is unduly increased in proportion to the capital, or the capital unduly diminished in proportion to the debt, you may be sure there

is a crisis brewing. When I commenced to examine the crisis of 1873 I had the impression that there had been a considerable diminution of circulating capital, owing to the railway and public and private building mania, the great fires, and the manifest increase of expenditure among all classes, for some years prior to the panic; but when I came to look at the tables of the bank deposits I found that I was mistaken. These deposits are an accurate index of the amount of circulating capital in the country at different times, and the loans and discounts of the banks are an accurate index of the amount of debt contracted at different times. Of course there are other debts (a very large amount), not shown in the bank loans and other circulating property (especially in the districts not provided with banks), not shown in the deposits; but the movement of loans and deposits is a *perfectly good criterion to show what is going on in the community*. Well, we find that from 1868 to September 12, 1873, the national bank deposits had increased \$43,000,000, but the loans had increased in the same time \$283,000,000—that is, the aggregate debt had increased 50 per cent. in five years, while the aggregate circulating capital had increased only  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The capital during this period had been and continued to be practically a fixed quantity.<sup>1</sup> Only the surplus produced each year, added to what was

(1) This view is confirmed by the internal traffic of the country. The number of tons moved by railway showed an average increase from year to year, which continued, as did also the bank deposits, after the panic. Poor's "Railway Manual of the United States," a standard authority, shows that the quantity of goods transported (measured by tons) was somewhat greater in 1874 than in 1873, although the gross earnings were \$6,000,000 less. The following comparative statement is compiled from the same authority, showing the railway earnings, operating expenses, &c., for the calendar years 1873 and 1874.

Year.	Number of Miles.	Gross Earnings.	Operating Expenses.	Percentage of Expenses to Gross Earnings.	Net Earnings.	Dividends.
1873	70,651	526,419,935	342,609,373	65.1	183,810,562	67,120,709
1874	72,623	520,466,016	330,895,058	63.6	189,570,958	67,042,942

The external traffic showed a similar but more irregular increase. The following tables show the imports and exports of merchandise (gold values) for a series of years, including the year of panic.

Year ending June 30th.	Imports.	Exports.
	\$	\$
1868	358,733,098	370,555,738
1869	414,256,243	371,046,149
1870	452,875,665	465,208,341
1871	518,759,518	478,115,292
1872	573,912,888	476,421,478
1873	684,633,736	575,227,017
1874	595,885,248	633,339,368

"I doubt if there would be found a single example of a great increase of fixed capital, at a time and place where circulating capital was not rapidly increasing likewise." Mill's "Political Economy," Book I, chapter vi.



borrowed from abroad, had been invested in railways, buildings, and other fixed property; but the aggregate amount of debt was a steadily increasing quantity; growing more top-heavy each year, until, like an inverted pyramid, a very slight push or gust of wind would tip it over. That the reaction really commenced in 1872 is shown by the extraordinary rise in the rate of interest, and by the great increase in the number of failures, and the amount of liabilities represented, over the previous year. Nevertheless the centre of gravity was not thrown wholly outside the base till the following year. During this twelvemonth the bank loans increased \$68,000,000, against an increase of only \$7,000,000 in the deposits—that is, the debts increased  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in one year, while the available capital increased only  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. In New York city, where the avalanche of insolvency first began to move, the indebtedness increased during that year, by the same showing, 13 per cent., while the available capital *decreased* 5 per cent. The failure of Jay Cooke and Company did not produce the panic in any other way than this—that it disclosed to the public the pre-existing fact that the aggregate indebtedness was too great to be paid out of the circulating capital. If John Doe has borrowed some millions, payable on demand, having nothing better to sell than Northern Pacific bonds, and if Richard Roe comes into the market with some millions of bushels of wheat, and both are striving to get possession of the same—I had almost said money, but it is better to stick to the text and say circulating capital, that is, iron, shoes, cloth, sugar, pork, furniture, &c.—then if there is not enough for both, Richard Roe will surely get it and John Doe will fail. And so as to all the rest. Those whose debts are largest, in proportion to their means of commanding the circulating capital of the country, or, in the language of commerce, those whose liabilities are largest in proportion to their available assets, will fail first. Those debts, contracted on a scale of imaginary prosperity, were incapable of shrinking down to the real facts. When the facts were actually disclosed in September, 1873, every business man was quick to recognise their import, and all clutched simultaneously at the means of payment. This clutching constituted the panic.

Monetary panics are always of short duration. A few months after the panic of 1873, money was plentiful in all the business centres, and borrowers with good collaterals could get all they wanted at 4 per cent.; but the crisis—the Nemesis of the violated laws of commerce—was taking vengeance in all directions upon the guilty and the innocent, and especially upon the innocent—the labourers in furnaces and factories, the sewing women, and the small savings depositors. A panic is usually described as a want of confidence, with the implication that if people would only have confidence

business would settle down into its customary channel. And so it would, if the want of confidence were not well founded. But if the deck-load of liabilities is really too great for the ballast of capital, the craft will turn over, and no proclamation of confidence can stay it up; nor can any issue of bank notes or government notes prop it up. The deficiency is a deficiency not of promises to pay, but of *the means of payment*, and the means of payment are the commodities of commerce, including the commodity gold, which foreigners are always willing to take in exchange for their surplus, or for any debts we may be owing them.

What followed the panic, and what continues to this day, is the painful and impossible effort to pay a very large amount of indebtedness with a relatively small amount of capital. The portion which cannot be paid must be sponged out by the bankruptcy courts or by compromise. Meanwhile, as railway extension and large building operations have come to a pause, and as nearly all persons are deprived of some part of their usual and expected income, and are forced to economize in their expenditures, we have the phenomenon of a glut in the market, and this at a time when, as has been shown, there is really a deficiency of commodities to pay existing debts with. The apparent anomaly would disappear if the holders of the surplus commodities would give them to the bankrupt debtors to pay off their liabilities with; for consumption would then revive. The holders of Northern Pacific bonds—this case is used for illustration merely—being in receipt of their usual income, would be able once more to purchase. The production of the country had adjusted itself before the panic to a certain rate of consumption, and when consumption was checked production went on, not so rapidly as before, but still too rapidly for the diminished means of consumers. Over-production, stagnation, and loss of employment are thus explained. The duration of the hard times depends for the most part on the percentage that bankrupt estates are able to pay, and on the expeditiousness of the payment.<sup>1</sup> Something will depend upon

(1) "Estimating the average yield of failed estates to be 33½ per cent. (under the operations of the new bankruptcy law it will fall far short of that), the actual loss to capital account, by the failures of the year (1875), will stand at about \$120,000,000. This amount is equivalent to the value of one half of the cotton crop, and is more by 30 per cent. than the entire yield of all the gold and silver mines of the country. It is a serious loss that individuals have to bear, to be deducted from the profits of business, or to trench on the accumulations of previous years. This 120 millions of loss represents a profit at 10 per cent. on 1,200 millions of dollars of business; in other words, that amount of business of the country for the past year has been done for nothing, the profits being absorbed by losses. This loss of 120 millions of dollars is luckily diffused over a good many centres of trade, and has been pretty equally divided between individual concerns; but it is safe to infer that, coupled with the decline in values, the loss by bad debts must have caused a shrinkage more apparent than in any year since the panic."—R. G. Dun and Co.'s Annual Circular, for the year 1875.

"The figures which we present herewith do not give much encouragement to the

the number of failures yet to come. To ascertain what is requisite to restore general prosperity is a complicated problem, since some trades are depressed more than others, wheat-growing being fairly prosperous, while iron-smelting is nearly prostrate. Between these extremes many degrees of depression are to be found. Given a certain number of people trained to certain vocations, and a certain amount of fixed capital, what is needed to put the unemployed portion to work? Manifestly either new markets, or such a lessening of the cost of production as will bring their respective commodities within reach of a larger body of consumers. Both wages and profits have already fallen in particular trades, and it seems probable that they will fall still more—how much more can only be determined by the course of events. Free-trade would lessen the cost of production by giving manufacturers cheaper materials, and would thereby open new markets to certain articles. It is therefore suggested as one step, and an important one, out of the present slough.

The currency has been purposely left out of view in discussing the financial crisis, partly because it tends to befog the real facts constituting the crisis, and partly because I conceive that it had very little to do with bringing it on. It could have had nothing to do with it except in one of two ways, either by diminishing the amount of circulating capital, or by increasing the amount of indebtedness based thereon. Some persons contend that the use of an irredeemable currency does stimulate the creation of debts. That it should do so while the currency is expanding—that is, while it is depreciating—can be very easily understood, since it offers to speculators the opportunity of pocketing the difference between its value to-day and its value at a future time, but that it should tend to this result in any great degree while the volume is stationary, I cannot perceive. Hence I reject the notion that the currency, irredeemable though it be, was any considerable agent in bringing on the crisis. A similar crisis exists at the present time in countries where the currency has all the time been redeemable in gold, and other crises, and worse ones, have existed in America at periods when the currency was redeemable in gold. Indeed, similar crises have occurred in places where there was no paper currency whatever. Irredeemable currency has sins enough of its own to answer for without loading it with transgressions in no way peculiar to it, and having an entirely different parentage.

belief that the return of a prosperous condition is any nearer, except in the passage of time, than a year ago. The business of the country, in every department, continues to be restricted to the narrowest limits. Without a corresponding reduction in expenses, and in the face of declining prices of all staples, the possibilities of profit have been slight indeed. It is, therefore, not a matter of surprise that so many have succumbed to the pressure of the times; the wonder rather is, that with all the discouragement which in the past two or three years has been experienced, so many survive in a condition of apparent stability."—*Ibid.*, first quarter of 1876,

The practical exemption of France from the financial crises which periodically afflict America, England, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, deserves our attention. Even the great financial typhoon of 1857, which swept around the world and across the equator, only skirted the edges of France, causing a few failures in Havre and Marseilles, chiefly in the American trade, and advancing the rate of discount of the Bank of France for a short time to 10 per cent.<sup>1</sup> For all practical purposes France was in the centre of a cyclone, enjoying a calm, while the rest of the civilised world was strewn with every species of commercial desolation. And such has been her position in the crisis of 1873, notwithstanding the payment of the milliards to Germany. Germany, however, the recipient of the milliards, has been convulsed with hard times and mercantile distress. The reason is simply that the Frenchman is very little addicted to going in debt, very little inclined to speculate, and very much given to hoarding his gains. Perhaps he does not get rich quite so fast as his neighbour across the Channel, but on the other hand he keeps what he gets, and generally escapes those terrible financial crashes that smite the Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon countries with such clockwork regularity. The Frenchman seems to have taken to heart the lesson taught by the great Mississippi bubble, to keep out of mad speculations. Neither the Englishman nor his offspring, the American, learned anything of lasting value from the South Sea bubble or the score of bubbles that have since burst at different times on their hands. Nor has the plodding and methodical German, so apt a scholar in many directions, learned this lesson, although commended to him by frequent and severe chastisement. There is no mystery whatever in the healthy condition of the French finances and French trade since the payment of the German war indemnity. France habitually holds not less than £240,000,000 sterling of the precious metals.<sup>2</sup> Such a reserve of the most realisable property known to commerce, coupled with the national prudence on the subject of debt, and the national habit of putting little or no money into things they know nothing about, very readily accounts for the practical exemption of France from these sore visitations. It is an encouraging sign of the times that the French people are beginning to appreciate their high position in the world of industry and commerce, and to place thrift, in which they indubitably excel, in the balance against military prowess, in which they can no longer claim pre-eminence.

(1) Art. "Les Crises Commerciales et Monétaires," by E. de Laveleye, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1, 1866. From another article in the *Revue* (Nov. 16, 1866), by V. Bonnet, it appears that an advance of the rate of discount to 7 per cent. by the Bank of France is considered there a financial crisis.

(2) V. Bonnet, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 1, 1873.

Much stress is laid by some writers on the agency of banks in bringing on financial crises by an undue expansion of loans or note circulation, or both. Perhaps we have a right to expect that bankers will be wiser than others in discerning the approach of these catastrophes, and more prudent in applying the brakes to prevent them. But, in fact, they are not wiser than others, they never have been—unless those of Scotland may be called an exception—and they probably never will be. They live in the same atmosphere as other people, and when it becomes surcharged with the oxygen of high prices, large profits, active speculation, and a delusive prosperity, they become exhilarated with the rest, and make large loans. They are importuned to do so by their customers, and impelled to do so by their interest. It is the high prices, the large profits, the speculation, and the appearance of prosperity, that bring on bank expansion. It is not bank expansion that causes the high prices, the speculation, &c. It is not in the power of banks to expand either their loans or their note circulation, except in response to a pre-existing outside demand. Bank notes redeemable in coin do not raise prices. The competition of buyers in the market does this.<sup>1</sup> After every great crisis the banks are fiercely denounced for their excessive expansion. Or rather, they are first denounced for not expanding more, and then for having expanded so much previously. Both accusations are mainly unjust. As to expanding more in the midst of a panic, that is a sheer impossibility. Each frog is as big as an ox already—unless he has been an exceptionally prudent, unambitious member of the community—and his very existence depends on getting down to his natural size. The other reproach is likewise unjust, unless we assume that bankers ought to be wiser than everybody else in the trading community, and sufficiently wiser and stronger to hold everybody else in check. In countries where banking is free—and private banking is free in all civilised countries—it is perfectly futile to expect any such thing, since depositors will generally place their funds where they can get the amount of accommodation they think they are entitled to. Even the Scotch bankers, whose prudence and prescience on the whole have excited general admiration, can show in their own midst some of the worst cases of financial incendiarism on record.

What it is that sets a general speculation going can hardly be considered an open question. The tendency of profits to a minimum, the competition of capital, the smallness of the field of employment in particular countries, the restiveness of the owners of capital when they find their profits growing less and less, the temptation to

(1) This is a principle sought to be established (and successfully established) in Tooke's "History of Prices." The distinction between bank notes and other credit instruments on the one hand, and the "act of buying," on the other, as applied to this subject, is very clearly presented in Mr. Bonamy Price's "Principles of Currency," p. 168.

embark in new schemes when old and well-tried investments have absorbed all the capital that can be profitably employed in them : all this is so lucidly set forth in Book IV. chapter iv. of Mill's Political Economy, that nothing remains to be said on that point, except that the antecedents of the last American crisis were a striking verification of the theory. The accumulation of capital had been manifested in the steady advance of public securities, the infallible sign of the competition of investors, and the usual precursor of that sort of enterprise which ends in a financial crash. The experience of 1857 had been forgotten ; the war was ended and the road was clear for a fresh run. England, by virtue of her smaller territory and her larger annual surplus, had another break-down in 1866, yielding one failure (that of Overend, Gurney, & Co.,) with liabilities of nearly nineteen millions sterling, or more than one-third of all the mercantile failures that happened in the United States in 1873. The field of employment for capital in America is still a large one, but it is not so large as formerly. Every year witnesses a nearer approach of population to the arid plains of the West. The railway development of the country is a long way in advance of population at present, and that outlet for surplus earnings is closed for a considerable time. What direction the competition of capital will take next is not certain, but it is more likely to be in the way of free-trade and foreign commerce than any other. Resumption of specie payments can be effected at any time when there is a real purpose and desire on the part of the political majority to accomplish it. It can be done either by funding the surplus greenbacks in an interest-bearing bond, or by applying a portion of the public revenues to the redemption and cancellation of such surplus, or (which is the most awkward and expensive mode), by accumulating a mass of gold in the treasury to redeem them over the counter. Any mode which may be adopted implies a contraction of the currency to the volume needed for that portion of the country's business in which currency is actually used, viz. :—hand-money or pocket-money as distinguished from bank funds. So much ignorance, demagogism, and unenlightened selfishness, are enlisted in this battle of Gog and Magog, that some stern use of executive or judicial power may be necessary to put an end to it ; for there is mischief enough hidden in it to divide the Union and revolutionise the component parts. That the greenback is a past-due note, a defaulted I.O.U., and every reissue of it, after it has been taken in for taxes, an illegal act as well as a shameful one, is perfectly clear to lawyers as well as economists.<sup>1</sup>

(1) The United States Supreme Court, in the case of *Hepburn v. Griswold*, held that the power to make Government notes a legal tender existed, if at all, only as a necessary and proper means to carry on war. This view was virtually sustained in the subsequent opinion of the Court in the *Legal Tender* cases, although the judgment in *Hepburn v. Griswold* was reversed.

In conclusion I ask, is it not humiliating that the Anglo-Saxon race, who have achieved so much in the way of conquering natural obstacles, subduing the earth, civilising barbarous tribes, establishing free institutions, and promoting education, cannot subsist without sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind of a financial crisis, two or three times in each generation? Is it not possible for the English-speaking people (and the German-speaking people as well) to perform their important office in the world without bringing upon themselves periodically these direful visitations? Must our trade degenerate into gambling every few years, and by its evil consequences plunge great multitudes of innocent people into the depths of misery? The mere destruction or expulsion of surplus capital from a country of high productive powers is not a very great evil, since the vacuum is so speedily and easily filled. But considering the noble uses to which it might be applied, it would be best not to lose it. The distribution of wealth has become a more important consideration in Europe and America than its production, and here I venture to think that the French are in advance of other nations, not in virtue of any written theory, or governmental policy, but through those close-fisted habits which have been handed down from father to son and mother to daughter—the habit not merely of living within one's means, but of keeping one's means well in sight—contentment with small gains, and horror of debt. Where these national habits exist, and to the extent that they exist, the fuel of financial crises is wanting, and the poor are not liable to be thrown on their savings for support every few years during the interval of readjustment between a crisis and a revival of trade. It is not proposed to discuss here the merits and demerits of hoarding the precious metals, which is, after all, only a question of having more or less ready means in proportion to the extent of one's business. We all know that the Frenchman *will* hoard to a large extent, and that the Englishman and American *will not*. Let us accept the fact as it is, and with it the fact that when financial gales blow the Frenchman carries more ballast than any rival craft afloat. Probably the Anglo-Saxon peoples—I might have mentioned Canada in discussing the crisis of 1873, for she has suffered quite as much *per capita* as the States—will continue to go headlong at intervals in the future as in the past. Within a short time we have heard of a movement, seriously considered by the English Government, to appoint a standing commission to suspend the Bank Act in times of great stringency. This might be likened to a farmer permanently lowering the fence that confines his cattle, because it had been deemed expedient at some former times to take down the top rail. If suspension of the Bank Act is ever useful, its utility consists in quieting the fears of those who have no debts to pay—in stopping a

run for deposits—in checking a blind panic. Those who have debts to pay will still be compelled to draw out their funds. But the knowledge that there is a standing commission to suspend the Act will encourage traders to take greater risks, and thus tend to bring about the contingency for which the commission is appointed. And in the end the Bank itself must be the judge, and the sole judge, of its ability to exchange its notes payable on demand for the notes of merchants payable some time hence. The Bank has no power to create *the means of payment*, and there is fortunately no power to compel it to expose itself to insolvency any more than a private individual. So many lessons have been administered to the Anglo-Saxon communities on the subject of financial crises, without effect, that it might seem to have become a matter of general agreement and convention among them that a crisis once in a while is a good thing. Very few Americans are of that opinion to-day.

HORACE WHITE.

## A BALLAD OF PAST MERIDIAN.

ONE night returning from my twilight walk  
 I met the grey mist Death, whose eyeless brow  
 Was bent on me, and from his hand of chalk  
 He reached me flowers as from a withered bough :  
 O Death, what bitter nosegays givest thou !

### II.

Death said, "I gather," and pursued his way.  
 Another stood by me, a shape in stone,  
 Sword-hacked and iron-stained, with breasts of clay,  
 And metal veins that sometimes fiery shone :  
 O Life, how naked and how hard when known !

### III.

Life said, "As thou hast carved me," such am I.  
 Then memory, like the nightjar on the pine,  
 And sightless hope, a woodlark in night sky,  
 Joined notes of Death and Life till night's decline :  
 Of Death, of Life, those inwound notes are mine.

GEORGE MEREDITH.



## EARLY AUTUMN ON THE LOWER YANG-TZE.

IN Western lands the most welcome and most joyous of the seasons is the spring. In all ages poets have hymned its arrival, or invoked its approach. From sunny Italy to the chill and brumal North, they have sung the grateful change wrought upon the face of nature by the Favonian breeze, and the ethereal mildness of gentle spring. Its smiling sunlight and fertilising showers, its promise of a warmer and more productive time, have excited the imaginations of many more than poets, and have enriched the speech of nations with pleasing metaphors. The foreign sojourner in distant China, with half the globe between him and his Western home, hails with delight the advent of a more sober season. Having passed over vast and stormy seas, he has changed not only climate, but his mind—at least in this. The stifling heat and heavy rains of July and August have passed away. The fiery fierceness of the summer sun is no longer to be dreaded, nor the sweltering temperature of a cloudy afternoon. Cool mornings and delicious evenings, with noons not too sultry, make up the early autumn day. A delicate azure, broken by the white of fleecy clouds, replaces the brazen ardour of the summer sky, or the heavy fall of cloud and mist of the rainy months. The soft moisture of the oppressive south-west wind is dispelled, and the reviving breezes of the north-east monsoon blow gaily.

In the foreign settlements life enters upon a new phase. It is as though limbs were stretched and exercised after an interval of enforced repose. The Western stranger bethinks him of the sports and pastimes of his countrymen in their own land. The stable regains its interest; the race-committee is elected; the walls of the club-house display notices of the "autumn meeting," and lists of the events of the approaching race-week. On roads, and on open ground near the settlement, Chinese grooms—quaint objects, clad, but for the incongruous exception of the strange head-gear of their nation, in strict equestrian costume—are encountered leading out to exercise the "entries" for these events; diminutive steeds as carefully enveloped in the regulation clothing, as though just arrived from Eltham or the Wolds. But there are no such costly imports into China now. The golden age of foreign commerce, when the trade lay in the hands of a few princely firms, has gone, and with it many extravagances. The senior and junior messes at the *Hongs*, with their bounteous table and ever-flowing wines, have disappeared, and no "cracks" come from Europe to dispute the prizes of the Chinese turf with the native princes.

As autumn comes on, sportsmen look to their guns. The flight of birds moving southward is noted at seaports farther north, and the house-boat—most commodious of river conveyances—is prepared. On all sides there are symptoms of a cooler air. The punkah is unhooked from the ceiling, the punkah-coolie is paid off, and fire-places and stoves are set in order. Even the mosquito-curtain disappears from the bedroom;—this last being perhaps the most welcome of all the signs of autumn. Summer migrants from Shang-hai to cooler and more salubrious spots—to the heights and baths of Hakone, and the sea-bathing of Chefoo—return home. Passengers begin to arrive from Europe, and homeward-bound steamers carry but few away. Foreign admirals come in in their flag-ships, mustering their squadrons in the Woo-Sung River, and announce their arrival by thundering salutes. The anchorage is filled with steamers and stately clipper ships. The streets of the foreign settlement are crowded with a busy population, foreign and Chinese—officers, merchants, sailors on shore from the ships, braves from the camp outside the south gate of the native city, Chinese coolies and servants, jostle each other in a living stream as wide as that which flows through Cheapside at noon. On the Bund—the wide esplanade that embanks the river—pass and repass, in endless ebb and flow, handsome equipages, in which ride fashionably dressed European ladies—*jin-rik-shas*, or man-power carriages, and the high-wheeled barrows—the hackney-coach of Eastern China. The Bund itself is a scene worth notice: a few years ago it was a foul, unwholesome marsh, scored with the runlets made by the receding tide. Now it rivals the quays of Paris. Well-kept and prettily laid-out gardens adorn its widest part. It is edged with bungalows embowered in shrubs and flowers, spacious consular residences, and imposing buildings, the premises of banks and great public companies, thronged with Western clerks and native *shroffs* and *compradores*. The styles of architecture are various—some stately, some fantastic. The prevailing style inclines to the classical, and is, according to the local jest, not Doric, but *Compradoric*. But the whole is not without a certain grandeur and an air of wealth.

Twelve miles lower down the Wong-pu—the branch of the Yangtze which flows past Shang-hai—the stream is crossed by a bar of mud and silt, which precludes the approach to the city of heavy vessels. Therefore the huge ironclads and great frigates of the Western admirals lie moored below it, off the village of Woo-Sung. Their presence imparts liveliness to a usually dreary spot. Abreast of where they lie stand but three houses of European build, of which one is deserted; another is the office of the Great Northern Telegraph Company, the pioneer of telegraph enterprise in China. The banks on either side are low and uniformly flat. The entrance

to the river from the wide embouchure of the great Yang-tze recalls the lower Scheldt. Indeed, not in the configuration of the ground alone can a resemblance be traced to the Low Countries of Western Europe. A fleet of high-sterned craft, such as Vandervelde might have painted, is working up the river with a favourable tide. Clumps of green poplars break the sky-line, and diversify the dead level of the scene. Beneath their shade here and there come down to slake their thirst in the river, groups of cattle, recalling the canvas of Cuyt. Berghem or Hobbema might have painted such landscapes as those on which the eye can rest on either side.

The prospect of a stay of some weeks at Woo-Sung gave promise to the writer of but a dreary time. Cut off by the twelve miles of stream—the regular highway—from the pleasures and conveniences of Shang-hai, Occidentals, doomed to loiter below the bar, might well be forgiven their grumblings at the dullness of the place. The shooting season had not yet begun, or at any rate had hardly begun in these thickly populated plains. That unfailling resource of the sailor on shore—riding on horseback—was denied in this roadless district. A whirling current and muddy fore-shores precluded all hope of that most cheerful of naval recreations—hauling the seine. Kicking a foot-ball about the narrow strip of meadow that intervened between the embankment and the stream, or attempting sphairistiké on a polygonal scrap of rugged lawn, would inevitably grow tiresome when the ball in one case was being perpetually kicked into the river, or in the other being knocked into a fetid drain. Resignation came at length, and was in some sort a solace; and a conscientious attempt was made to take advantage of whatsoever was interesting and novel in the surrounding scene.

To some at least the attempt turned out to be by no means unsuccessful. There was an air of strangeness about all that was seen and heard—about place, people, and occupations—which long retained its freshness and the pleasure-giving faculty of a new sensation. There was something almost startling in the obtrusive contact daily, nay hourly, observed between ancient habits and the most recent phases of modern civilisation. A mile farther down the stream, the brilliant flame of a Western lighthouse of the newest pattern gleamed throughout the night. A long line of telegraph posts stood gauntly up from the level fields. An endless succession of steamers—provided with the latest improvements in construction and equipment—passed and repassed, bound up or down the Yang-tze, or to or from the coast-ports north and south of the great river. Whilst within a stone's throw of the water's edge slumbered, as it were, in perfect unconsciousness of all these symptoms of progress, the China of Confucius. On the water the vivacity of the scene was heightened by depth of contrast. Huge river-steamers, such as ascend the St.

Lawrence or crowd the levées at New Orleans, were constantly going to, or returning from, Hankow, six hundred miles above the mouth of the great stream, their decks crowded with natives of the middle kingdom, and their names inscribed in Chinese characters on their paddle-boxes. A whole fleet of trading-vessels of recent European type plied between Shang-hai and the other ports, bearing the dragon flag, which it has become a convention of the sea to recognise as the ensign of China. Trim ships of the Peninsular and Oriental Company and the statelier vessels of the *Messageries Maritimes* threaded their way amidst fleets of junks of a form so ancient as to have been familiar in these waters before the alluvial flats on either hand were laid down. The stillness of the early autumn morning air was perpetually broken by a noisy concert of sailors' voices. The deep song of the Western leadsmen calling the soundings, and the sharp orders of the European pilots, mingled with the chant of the Chinese mariners, hoisting the sails of mat, or celebrating their return from the open sea by the loud crackle of fireworks exploded in sacrifice to the River-god. Smart pilot-schooners, trim and saucy as Solent yachts, skimmed lightly over the smooth surface of the stream. Whilst the lumbering junks of Amoy and Ningpo, with their multiplicity of masts and towering poops, dropped slowly down to run home again before the monsoon, which, with Oriental patience, had been awaited for nine six months.

Once landed on the river-shore, the stranger left behind him almost all trace of Western intrusion, save indeed when an occasional backward glance revealed above the trees the tall masts of foreign vessels, or a black cloud of coal-smoke from the funnel of a steamer. The landscape was as strange and foreign as were the inhabitants and their customs. For many miles to the right and to the left, to the front and on the other side of the river, stretched the wide level of a vast alluvial plain, which in less than a thousand years<sup>1</sup> has grown up between the city of Shang-hai and the sea. Roads there were none, but between the fields there were numerous smooth but narrow paths on which pedestrians could walk easily and comfortably in Indian file. The top of the embankment of the river offered a convenient, but rather roundabout way to Shang-hai. The path which ran along its summit for some seven or eight English miles met, six miles below the city, the broad and well-kept esplanade, known as *The Point* road, one of several handsome drives, constructed by the municipal council of the foreign settlement. A little farther inland was a broad strip of uncultivated land reserved, and in some shape actually put in order, for what will be the first

\* "The custom-house officer was in A.D. 1101 ordered to remove to Shang-hai, which then became the seaport, and rapidly increased in importance."—"Shang-hai considered Socially." By H. Lang. 2nd edit., p. 5. Shanghai, 1876.

railway in China. But that this is crossed in several places by broad canals, it would soon become the high-road between Woo-Sung and the city. As it was, our road—the usual one—wound in its greater length between fields and farmhouses, through villages, and past temples in the most perplexing meanderings. Canals and streams had to be crossed on bridges of long slabs of stone, sometimes double, but often only single, and so narrow as to make crossing a somewhat precarious undertaking.

The whole surface of the plain was covered with the autumn cotton-crop still standing. The economic husbandry of China lays hold of every bit of ground, and not a single rood was lying fallow. In the spring this vast extent of cotton-covered ground, now a snowy expanse of fleecy bolls, starred here and there with bright sulphur-yellow blossom, had been one huge field of waving corn. During the rainy months, such is the fertility of the rich alluvial soil, it had produced its third crop—namely, rice. There was an air of quiet, of peace and plenty, pervading the whole district. Its denizens seemed neither to heed nor to require the products of other lands. Villages there were none to be seen. The inhabitants dwelt in single homesteads, or in snug cottages, collected in little groups, like tiny hamlets, of three or four. These pleasantly diversified the landscape. Clumps of trees, from between which peered out the quaint, curved roof, so marked a feature of the architecture of Eastern China, cut the sky-line, and redeemed the view from the dull monotony of an endless plain. The farms bore the aspect of being owned by the well-to-do. As the narrow pathway passed in front of each prosperous-looking homestead, it widened into a smooth esplanade. On the one hand a broad trench divided the roadway from the fields; on the other ran a neat lattice-fence, deftly woven of split bamboo—often overgrown with a luxuriant creeper which surrounded the little garden and the various farm-buildings. Within this fence stood the stately trees which overshadowed the roofs, and rows of a slim and graceful bamboo growing not in clusters as farther south, but in single stems. The little plot between the house-walls and the paling was planted with lettuces and other vegetables. The Chinese husbandman grudges even a corner to garden-flowers; but here and there bloomed a few asters or chrysanthemums which would put our Temple-garden shows to shame; and, once in a way, the gorgeous crimson of the gigantic Chinese cockscomb glowed against the dingy background of the farmhouse wall. The first tints of autumn were already deepening on the leaves, and rich yellows, browns, and reds added colour to a picture which would otherwise have presented too great a sameness of hue.

The dwellings invariably faced the esplanade, and filled up an interval in the fence which joined them at either end. We will

describe one. It was long and low, without an upper story. The principal room was in the centre, and was entered by wide folding doors. Within it the members of the family who were not in the fields could be seen at meals, or at indoor work. Some few, perhaps, were weaving long strips of coarse cotton-cloth on the esplanade in front. At a window was an aged dame whirling a spinning-wheel, or turning the rollers of the simple machine that frees the white tufts of cotton from the seeds. A sharp, twanging sound issued from a chamber at the side. By inquiry we learnt that it was caused by young lads "teazing" the cotton into thin flakes with a quaint implement like a fiddle-bow. The stranger was received with civility, or rather with that absence of incivility which seems the sum-total of politeness among the Chinese.

A hideous chorus, set up by the yelping curs which infested every homestead in the neighbourhood; a sharp reproof from the farmer or his lads, which produced silence or low and scarcely audible growls; a ready response, in pantomime, to a question in the same form as to the way; and then a relapse into silence and busy labour, as though no one of foreign race was within a league—such was the stranger's only greeting.

The children and the younger women retreated within the gates, or back to the farther corners of the room, when the strange face of the "barbarian" was seen approaching. The former had already donned their winter clothing, as early and late the autumn air was fresh and nipping. The blue blouses and leggings, quilted and stuffed with cotton, were piled on one above another, till the little wearers looked like miniature balloons. The gait of the women, with their poor pinched feet, according to the universal custom in these northern provinces, was ungraceful in the extreme, and they toddled about in so uncertain a manner as to excite astonishment at their untiring industry in the fields. Their dress was tasteless in shape and colour; and their features lacked even the slight share of good looks possessed by their sisters of the provinces farther south.

There was little to attract the stranger to stay, or to induce him to investigate the style and processes of the native farm. Foul odours assailed his sense of smell as soon as he approached one of these latter. The ditch between the homestead and the fields was but a fetid sewer. Unutterable horrors were collected beneath the windows by the wayside, and the filth of the garments of men, women, and children was such as must be seen to be believed. The comfort and even abundance, of which so many signs were evident, was overlaid by a superlativeness of dirt which the squalor attendant on the most abject poverty can hardly match. The visitor gladly turned away to continue his walk, and to contemplate scenes which could only be enjoyed when looked at from afar.

Some way off from the farm rose a pile of buildings, evidently

those of a temple, as shown by two dark red poles in front. The walls, once vermilion, had faded through age and neglect to a dull orange. The ridge of the curved roof was ornamented with the scaly dragons so common in the ecclesiastical architecture of the country. Seen from a distance, there was a certain picturesqueness in the group. The orange tint harmonized not inaptly with the autumn hues of the surrounding groves. The bright green and yellow enamel of the earthenware monsters on the roof-tree, seen through Charles Lamb's "lucid atmosphere of fine Cathay," brightened a prospect not too wealthy in gay colours. On close inspection the charm of a distant view faded away. The buildings were little better than squalid barns. A wide opening in the front exposed an interior with three altars, and three hideous deities bedizened with a tawdry finery, rendered almost ghastly by filth and dust. A gateway at the side admitted to an ill-paved courtyard. On one side were the dwellings of the priests and keepers of the temple, store-houses, and hay-lofts; on the other an odd museum of spare divinities, clad, as the cold weather had approached, in faded garments of quilted cotton.

Here and there the plain was dotted with mounds of many sizes and varied shapes, the sepulchres of many generations of farmers of these lower Yang-tze shores. Some of these mounds were freshly made, and preserved their strictly conical form and sharp apex. Others were fading into the dead level around them, and were being more and more encroached upon by the ploughs and spades of the practically minded descendants of the departed agriculturists sleeping beneath. These barrows were not the only objects which marked the burial-places of the dead. Occasionally, tombs of brick with black-tiled roofs and whitewashed walls—miniature copies of the houses of the living—were met with. In many cases unburied coffins, sometimes perhaps lightly covered with a thin thatch of straw, were lying in the fields waiting till the priests should declare the geomantic conditions suitable for committing their mouldering contents to the ground.

Turning from these, we came upon a very different scene in the drama of life. Harsh but not discordant music was heard coming from a little troop conveying a bride to her new home. In front marched two musicians, one with a trumpet, the other with a kind of fife, from which instruments they occasionally drew out the fragments of a tune. The bride was hidden within the recesses of a scarlet-covered chair. The bearers and musicians were decked with unusual finery in honour of the occasion. Smart official hats with saucer brims and crimson tassels were on their heads, and loose garments of blue silk, covered, but scarcely hid, their own private rags. Behind the chair, on litters and frames of wood, painted a bright vermilion, were

borne the bridal presents, and the viands to be consumed at the wedding-feast—sweetmeats, vegetables, and small roasted pigs. A few friends or relatives brought up the rear of the small *cortège* as it wound and was lost to sight among the tombs.

In its many turnings the path again led the visitor to the near neighbourhood of the river. More music of the same kind, but somewhat more solemn and sonorous, was audible upon the right. From behind a clump of trees and bamboos, in which a snug homestead lay embowered, emerged a long procession. In front came the musicians, then several men carrying staves, then a gaily dressed object on a triumphal chair, and then a body of men and a very few women; all of whom together—perforce moving along the narrow path in single file—made up a goodly show. Upon the triumphal chair was seated, in gorgeous robes of scarlet, with a tinsel crown and jewels, a divinity of wood with a pink complexion, a long black beard, and Aryan features. The chair was borne high on the necks of four stalwart coolies; and by its side, steadying it as it swayed to and fro in its passage along the narrow way, walked with difficulty, owing to the narrowness of the path, a grave citizen of the higher class. Lictors, bearing stout staves, formed a body-guard. All—bearers, lictors, musicians—wore a peculiar head-dress, a kind of tall flower-pot-shaped hat, with a brim not unlike those seen in illustrations of the life of our English puritans.

As the procession passed in front of the homesteads, the inmates came out and exploded whole strings of crackers. In front of many houses small altars were placed, on which were burning slender scarlet tapers, and little sheaves of incense sticks placed in censers of brass or earthenware. Children were brought out by their mothers, and taught to render obeisance—to *chin-chin*, as the expression in the "Pidgin" dialect is—to the image as it was carried by. The blasts of music grow louder and louder, gongs were sounded, more crackers were exploded, and the procession turned off to wind about amongst the fields. Strange and grotesque as it all was, it still reminded the spectator of the periodical outings of St. Spiridione to bless the vineyards of the olive-groves of Corfu. Its meaning was thus explained in "Pidgin" by a bystander who had a slight knowledge of that wonderful dialect. Thrice a year the divinity is carried forth in solemn procession, that sickness may be warded off from the country.

A collection of *tumuli* lying in one spot, rather closer together than was usual, formed quite a hillock on the unending plain. Thither the procession wended its way, and on the summit of the eminence, in front of a table beneath an awning, the image was deposited. An attendant fired off four barrels of a quaint petard, volleys of crackers were exploded, and a fire was lighted on the



ground before the image. A Bonze, with completely shaven head, then advanced, recited a long prayer, and scattered bowlfuls of cooked rice on all sides. Piles of Chinese offertory money, made of gold and silver paper, were offered up and burned in the fire. The Bonze rang a bell and said more prayers; the image was lifted up in its chair, and the procession moved onward on its way.

A small temple stood not far off. In its main hall the divinities were being regaled with a sumptuous banquet. Three long tables covered with viands—sweetmeats, fruits, vegetables, and the inevitable roasted pig—were stretched athwart the pavement of the hall. At the upper end of each were placed three images, both male and female, all bedizened with a tawdry finery of tinsel and inferior silk. Here was a veritable *lectisternium*; on a small provincial scale it is true, but perhaps not an inexact reproduction of the great *Epulum Jovis* held ages ago in the Roman Capitol. Crowds of peasants were standing outside looking on. In the court in front were piled strange-looking instruments of music—fifes, trumpets of prodigious length, and guitars made of snake-skin.

In these sights there was nothing to recall even the existence of the Western nations, whose great outpost of commerce was so near at Shang-hai, and whose ships were covering the great river close at hand. But as the path along the river-bank was followed, many evidences of Western influence, and a quaint grafting of Western customs upon those of the Middle Kingdom were apparent. Woo-Sung was the scene of a smart action in the first war with a European power in which China was ever engaged, and long lines of parapet, forming a straggling and inefficient defence, pierced with many embrasures, could be traced upon the banks. But behind them a new work was rising, built upon different principles. Huge casemates were being constructed of balks of timber and iron plates from Europe, intended to hold guns as heavy as any that Woolwich can produce.<sup>1</sup> These works will be truly formidable to any enemy attempting to attack them in front. But the Chinese engineers, in carrying out the plans of foreigners, have had still some loyalty to ancient custom. So the forts were open in the rear, and were so placed that ships can lie behind an angle of the shore out of fire, and destroy the defenders.

Hundreds of men were at work hurrying on the construction. A large force of soldiers was lying in several entrenched camps close to. These men were disciplined and drilled in the English manner, and manœuvred in obedience to words of command given in English. They were armed with rifles, both breech and muzzle-loading, which they often practised with at targets on the shore. But at least one contingent of troops was still armed with spears and battle-axes;

(1) The successful construction of the 81-ton gun was not then known in China.

and it was a sight almost too suggestive to be comic, to witness a body of these exercising according to ancient fashion, and to an excessive tom-toming of a native drum, on the same parade-ground with comrades who complied with such directions as "Attention!" and "Quick march!" Large mud fortifications protected the camps. A common shape was that of a square, bastioned at the corners. The bastions bore some resemblance to those of Vauban, and were large enough to allow of an efficient flank defence; but the engineers had adhered to ancient plans, and had made their bastions mere solid masses of earth, and therefore shams. Imposing-looking *caponnières* and *tenailles* protected the curtains, but they were too slight to stop the passage even of a grape-shot.

Off the village a squadron of men-of-war junks lay at anchor. They were gaily dressed with flags—tricolours, white ensigns with vermilion characters upon them, and crimson streamers marked with legends in black. Higher up among the Western craft were handsome steam gunboats and a frigate, all armed with Krupp and Armstrong guns, with engines and hulls constructed by native artificers at Shang-hai or Foo-chow. The force of contrast could hardly go farther than in that presented by these two squadrons. Both were bravely decked with colours, those of the new type as well as their consort-junks. A new viceroy, who was to fix his seat at Nanking, was expected, and the vessels had mustered to do him honour.

He arrived in due time. In the early morning his vessel approached. The river-banks were alive with troops and spectators. Long lines of crimson banners gleamed through the slight mist just dispersing before the rising sun. The junks saluted with crackers and their guns of ancient form. More regular salutes were fired from the batteries by the troops on shore. The sailors of the frigate ran aloft, and manned the yards in imitation of the ceremonies obtaining in Western navies. There was a pleasant freshness in the gelid autumn air; and the waving banners and gay flags added brightness to an interesting scene. The viceroy was Shen-pao-Shan, a friend to foreigners, of whom it has been said, that he never took a bribe or perpetrated a "squeeze." The significance of such merits will be understood by all who know anything of a country cursed with that vilest of all governments, a literary bureaucracy.

The pure serenity of this day was followed, as usual, by a brilliantly moon-lit night. Sleep came readily to many to whom the heat of summer nights elsewhere had long denied it, and those who had visited numerous climes, agreed that few possess greater charms than does early autumn in far Eastern China.

CYPRIAN A. G. BRIDGE.

## AN AGNOSTIC'S APOLOGY.

An attempt has recently been made to obtain currency for the new nickname—Agnostic. Protests against nicknames are foolish; foolish because unavailing, and foolish because nicknames are always harmless. A protest in this case would be especially foolish; for the nickname in question seems to indicate a distinct advance in the courtesies of controversy. The old theological phrase for an intellectual opponent was Atheist—a name which still retains a certain flavour as of the stake in this world and hell-fire in the next, and which, moreover, implies an inaccuracy of some importance. Dogmatic Atheism—the doctrine that there is no God, whatever may be meant by God—is, to say the least, a rare phase of opinion. The word Agnosticism, on the other hand, seems to imply a fairly accurate appreciation of a form of creed already common and daily spreading. The Agnostic is one who asserts—what no one denies—that there are limits to the sphere of human intelligence. He asserts, further, what many theologians have expressly maintained, that those limits are such as to exclude at least what Mr. Lewes has so happily called “metempirical” knowledge. But he goes further, and asserts, in opposition to theologians, that theology lies within this forbidden sphere. This last assertion raises the important issue; and, though I have no pretension to invent an opposition nickname, I may venture for the purposes of this article to describe the rival school as Gnostics.

The Gnostic holds that our reason can in some sense transcend the narrow limits of experience. He holds that we can attain truths not capable of verification, and not needing verification, by actual experiment or observation. He holds, further, that a knowledge of those truths is essential to the highest interests of mankind, and enables us in some sort to solve the dark riddle of the universe. A complete solution, as every one admits, is beyond our power. But some answer may be given to the doubts which harass and perplex us when we try to frame any adequate conception of the vast order of which we form an insignificant portion. We cannot say why this or that arrangement is what it is; we can say, though obscurely, that some answer exists, and would be satisfactory if we could only find it. Overpowered, as every honest and serious thinker is at times overpowered, by the sight of pain, folly, and helplessness, by the jarring discords which run through the vast harmony of the universe, we are yet enabled to hear at times a whisper that all is well, to trust to it as coming from the

most authentic source, and to know that only the temporary bars of sense prevent us from recognising with certainty that the harmony beneath the discords is a reality and not a dream. This knowledge is embodied in the central dogma of theology. God is the name of the harmony; and God is knowable. Who would not be happy in accepting this belief, if he could accept it honestly? Who would not be glad if he could say with confidence, the evil is transitory, the good eternal: our doubts are due to limitations destined to be abolished, and the world is really an embodiment of love and wisdom, however dark it may appear to our faculties? And yet, if the so-called knowledge be illusory, are we not bound by the most sacred obligations to recognise the facts? Our brief path is dark enough on any hypothesis. We cannot afford to turn aside every *ignis fatuus* without asking whether it leads to sounder footing or to hopeless quagmires. Dreams may be pleasanter for the moment than realities; but happiness must be won by adapting our lives to the realities. And who that has felt the burden of existence, and suffered under well-meant efforts at consolation, will deny that such consolations are the bitterest of mockeries? Pain is not an evil; death is not a separation; sickness is but a blessing in disguise. Have the gloomiest speculations of avowed pessimists ever tortured sufferers like those kindly platitudes? Is there a more cutting piece of satire in the language than the reference in our funeral service to the "sure and certain hope of a blessed resurrection"? To dispel genuine hopes might be painful, however salutary. To suppress these spasmodic efforts to fly in the face of facts would be some comfort even in the distress which they are meant to alleviate.

Besides the important question whether the Gnostic can prove his dogmas, there is therefore the further question whether the dogmas, if granted, have any meaning. Do they answer our doubts or mock us with the appearance of an answer? The Gnostics pride themselves on their knowledge. Have they anything to tell us? They rebuke what they call the "pride of reason" in the name of a still more exalted pride. The scientific reasoner is arrogant because he sets limits to the faculty in which he trusts, and denies the existence of any other faculty. They are humble because they dare to tread in the regions which he declares to be inaccessible. But without bandying such accusations, or asking which pride is the greatest, the Gnostics are at least bound to show some ostensible justification for their complacency. Have they discovered a firm resting-place from which they are entitled to look down in compassion or contempt upon those who hold it to be a mere edifice of moonshine? If they have diminished by a scruple the weight of one passing doubt, we should be grateful: perhaps we should be converts. If not, why condemn Agnosticism?

I have said that our knowledge is in any case limited. I may add that, on any showing, there is a danger in failing to recognise the limits of possible knowledge. The word Gnostic has some awkward associations. It once described certain heretics who got into trouble from fancying that men could frame theories of the Divine mode of existence. The sects have been dead for many centuries. Their fundamental assumptions can hardly be quite extinct. Not long ago, at least, there appeared in the papers a string of propositions framed—so we were assured—by some of the most candid and most learned of living theologians. These propositions defined by the help of various languages the precise relations which exist between the persons of the Trinity. It is an odd, though far from an unprecedented, circumstance that the unbeliever cannot quote them for fear of profanity. If they were transplanted into the pages of the *Fortnightly Review*, it would be impossible to convince any one that the intention was not to mock the simple-minded persons who, we must suppose, were not themselves intentionally irreverent. It is enough to say that they defined the nature of God Almighty with an accuracy from which modest naturalists would shrink in describing the genesis of a black-beetle. I know not whether these dogmas were put forward as articles of faith, as pious conjectures, or as tentative contributions to a sound theory. At any rate, it was supposed that they were interesting to beings of flesh and blood. If so, one can only ask in wonder whether an utter want of reverence is most strongly implied in this mode of dealing with sacred mysteries; or an utter ignorance of, existing state of the world in the assumption that the question which really divides mankind is the double procession of the Holy Ghost; or an utter incapacity for speculation in the confusion of those dead exuvix of long-past modes of thought with living intellectual tissue; or an utter want of imagination, or of even a rudimentary sense of humour, in the hypothesis that the promulgation of such dogmas could produce anything but the laughter of sceptics and the contempt of the healthy human intellect?

The sect which requires to be encountered in these days is not one which boggles over the *filioque*, but certain successors of those Ephesians who told Paul that they did not even know "whether there were any Holy Ghost." But it explains some modern phenomena when we find that the leaders of theology hope to reconcile faith and reason, and to show that the old symbols have still a right to the allegiance of our hearts and brains, by putting forth these portentous propositions. We are struggling with hard facts, and they would arm us with the forgotten tools of scholasticism. We wish for spiritual food, and are to be put off with these ancient mummeries of forgotten dogma. If Agnosticism

is the frame of mind which summarily rejects these imbecilities, and would restrain the human intellect from wasting its powers on the attempt to galvanise into sham activity this *caput mortuum* of old theology, nobody need be afraid of the name. Argument against such adversaries would be itself a foolish waste of time. Let the dead bury their dead, and Old Catholics decide whether the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son or from the Father alone. Gentlemen indeed who still read the Athanasian Creed, and profess to attach some meaning to its statements, have no right to sneer at their brethren who persist in taking things seriously. But for men who long for facts instead of phrases, the only possible course is to allow such vagaries to take their own course to the limbo to which they are naturally destined, simply noting, by the way, that modern Gnosticism may lead to puerilities which one blushes even to notice.

It is not with such phenomena that we have seriously to deal. Nobody maintains that the unassisted human intellect can discover the true theory of the Trinity; and the charge of Agnosticism refers, of course, to the sphere of reason, not to the sphere of revelation. Yet those who attack the doctrine are chiefly believers in revelation; and as such they should condescend to answer one important question. Is not the denunciation of reason a commonplace with theologians? What could be easier than to form a catena of the most philosophical defenders of Christianity who have exhausted language in declaring the impotence of the unassisted intellect? Comte has not more explicitly enounced the incapacity of man to deal with the Absolute and the Infinite than a whole series of orthodox writers. Trust your reason, we have been told till we are tired of the phrase, and you will become Atheists or Agnostics. We take you at your word; we become Agnostics. What right have you to turn round and rate us for being a degree more logical than yourselves? Our right, you reply, is founded upon a Divine revelation to ourselves or our church. Let us grant—it is a very liberal concession—that the right may conceivably be established; but still you are at one with us in philosophy. You say as we say that the natural man can know nothing of the Divine nature. That is Agnosticism. Our fundamental principle is not only granted, but asserted. By what logical device you succeed in overleaping the barriers which you have declared to be insuperable is another question. At least you have no *primâ facie* ground for attacking our assumption that the limits of the human intellect are what you declare them to be. This is no mere verbal retort. Half, or more than half, of our adversaries agree formally with our leading principle. They cannot attack us without upsetting the very ground upon which the ablest advocates of their own case rely. The last English writer who professed to defend Christianity with weapons drawn from wide and genuine philosophical know-

ledge was Dean Mansel. The whole substance of his argument was simply and solely the assertion of the first principles of Agnosticism. Mr. Herbert Spencer, the prophet of the Unknowable, the foremost representative of Agnosticism, professes in his programme to be carrying "a step further the doctrine put into shape by Hamilton and Mansel." Nobody, I suspect, would now deny, nobody except Dean Mansel himself ever denied very seriously, that the "further step" thus taken was the logical step. Opponents both from within and without the Church, Mr. Maurice and Mr. Mill, agreed that this affiliation was legitimate. The Old Testament represents Jehovah as human, as vindictive, as prescribing immoralities; therefore Jehovah was not the true God; that was the contention of the infidel. We know nothing whatever about the true God, was the reply, for God means the Absolute and the Infinite. Any special act may come from God, for it may be a moral miracle; any attribute may represent the character of God to man, for we know nothing whatever of his real attributes, and cannot even conceive Him as endowed with attributes. The doctrine of the Atonement cannot be revolting, because it cannot have any meaning. Mr. Spencer hardly goes a step beyond his original, except, indeed, in candour.

Most believers repudiate Dean Mansel's arguments. They were an anachronism. They were fatal to the decaying creed of pure Theism, and powerless against the growing creed of Agnosticism. When theology had vital power enough to throw out fresh branches, the orthodox could venture to attack the Deist, and the Deist could assail the traditional beliefs. As the impulse grows fainter, it is seen that such a warfare is suicidal. The old rivals must make an alliance against the common enemy. The theologian must appeal for help to the metaphysician whom he reviled. Orthodoxy used to call Spinoza an Atheist; it is now glad to argue that even Spinoza is a witness on its own side. Yet the most genuine theology still avows its hatred of reason and distrusts sham alliances. Dr. Newman is not, like Dean Mansel, a profound metaphysician, but his admirable rhetoric expresses a far finer religious instinct. He feels more keenly if he does not reason so systematically; and the force of one side of his case is undeniable. He holds that the unassisted reason cannot afford a sufficient support for a belief in God. He declares, as innumerable writers of less power have declared, that there is "no medium, in true philosophy, between Atheism and Catholicity, and that a perfectly consistent mind, under those circumstances in which it finds itself here below, must embrace either the one or the other."<sup>1</sup> He looks in vain for any antagonist, except the Catholic Church, capable of baffling and withstanding "the fierce energy of passion, and the all-corroding, all-dissolving scepticism of the intellect in religious matters."<sup>2</sup> Some such doctrine is in fact but

(1) "History of my Religious Opinions," p. 322-3.

(2) *Ib.* p. 379.

a natural corollary from the doctrine of human corruption held by all genuine theologians. The very basis of orthodox theology is the actual separation of the creation from the creator. In the *Grammar of Assent*, Dr. Newman tells us that we "can only glean from the surface of the world some faint and fragmentary views" of God. "I see," he proceeds, "only a choice of alternatives in view of so critical a fact; either there is no creator or he has disowned his creatures."<sup>1</sup> The absence of God from his own world is the one prominent fact which startles and appals him. Dr. Newman, of course, does not see or does not admit the obvious consequence. He asserts most emphatically that he believes in the existence of God as firmly as in his own existence; and he finds the ultimate proof of this doctrine—a proof not to be put into mood and figure—in the testimony of the conscience. But he apparently admits that Atheism is as logical, that is, as free from self-contradiction, as Catholicism. He certainly declares that though the ordinary arguments are conclusive, they are not in practice convincing. Sound reason would of course establish theology; but corrupt man does not and cannot reason soundly. Dr. Newman, however, goes further than this. His Theism can only be supported by help of his Catholicity. If, therefore, Dr. Newman had never heard of the Catholic Church, if, that is, he were in the position of the great majority of men now living, and of the overwhelming majority of the race which has lived since its first appearance, he would be driven to one of two alternatives. Either he would be an Atheist or he would be an Agnostic. His conscience might say, there is a God; his observation would say, there is no God. Moreover, the voice of conscience has been very differently interpreted. Dr. Newman's interpretation has no force for any one who, like most men, does not share his intuitions. To such persons, therefore, there can be, on Dr. Newman's own showing, no refuge except the admittedly logical refuge of Atheism. Even if they shared his intuitions they would be necessarily sceptics until the Catholic Church came to their aid, for their intuitions would be in hopeless conflict with their experience. I need hardly add that, to some minds, the proposed alliance with reason of a Church which admits that its tenets are corroded and dissolved wherever free reason is allowed to play upon them, is rather suspicious. At any rate, Dr. Newman's arguments go to prove that man, as guided by reason, ought to be an Agnostic, and that, at the present moment, Agnosticism is the only reasonable faith for at least three-quarters of the race.

All, then, who think that men should not be dogmatic about matters beyond the sphere of reason or even conceivability, who hold that reason, however weak, is our sole guide, or who find that their conscience does not testify to the divinity of the Catholic God, but declares the

• (1) "*Grammar of Assent*," p. 392.



moral doctrines of Catholicity to be demonstrably erroneous, are entitled to claim such orthodox writers as sharing their fundamental principles, though refusing to draw the legitimate inferences. The authority of Dean Mansel and Dr. Newman may of course be repudiated. In one sense, however, they are simply stating an undeniable fact. The race collectively is agnostic, whatever may be the case with individuals. Newton might be certain of the truth of his doctrines whilst other thinkers were convinced of their falsity. It could not be said that the doctrines were certainly true, so long as they were doubted in good faith by competent reasoners. Dr. Newman may be as much convinced of the truth of his theology as Mr. Huxley of its error. But speaking of the race and not of the individual, there is no plainer fact in history than the fact that hitherto no knowledge has been attained. There is not a single proof of natural theology of which the negative has not been maintained as vigorously as the affirmative. The fact is notorious.

You tell us to be ashamed of professing ignorance. Where is the shame of ignorance in matters still involved in endless and hopeless controversy? Is it not rather a duty? Why should a lad who has just run the gauntlet of examinations and escaped to a country parsonage be dogmatic, when his dogmas are denounced as erroneous by half the philosophers of the world? What theory of the universe am I to accept as demonstrably established? At the very earliest dawn of philosophy men were divided by earlier forms of the same problems which divide them now. Shall I be a Platonist or an Aristotelian? a nominalist or a realist? Shall I admit or deny the existence of innate ideas? Shall I believe in the possibility or in the impossibility of transcending experience? Go to the mediæval philosophy, says one smart controversialist. To which mediæval philosophy, pray? And why should I believe you rather than the great thinkers of the seventeenth century, who agreed with one accord that the first condition of intellectual progress was the destruction of that philosophy? There would be no difficulty if it were a question of physical science. I might believe in Galileo and Newton and their successors down to Adams and Leverrier without hesitation, because they all substantially agree. But when men deal with the old problems there are still the old doubts. Shall I believe in Hobbes or in Descartes? Can I stop where Descartes stopped, or must I go on to Spinoza? Or shall I follow Locke's guidance, and end with Hume's scepticism? Or listen to Kant, and, if so, shall I decide that he is right in destroying theology or in reconstructing it, or in both performances? Does Hegel hold the key of the secret, or is he a mere spinner of jargon? May not Feuerbach or Schopenhauer represent the true development of metaphysical inquiry? Shall I put faith in Hamilton and Mansel, and, if so,

shall I read their conclusions by the help of Mr. Spencer, or shall I believe in Mill or in Mr. Lewes? State any one proposition in which all philosophers agree, and I will admit it to be true; or any one which has a manifest balance of authority, and I will agree that it is probable. But so long as every philosopher flatly contradicts the first principles of his predecessors, why affect certainty? The only agreement I can discover is, that there is no philosopher of whom his opponents have not said that his opinions lead logically either to Pantheism or to Atheism.

When all the witnesses thus contradict each other, the *prima facie* result is pure scepticism. There is no certainty. Who am I, if I were the ablest of modern thinkers, to say summarily that all the great men who differed from me are wrong, and so wrong that their difference should not even raise a doubt in my mind? From such scepticism there is indeed one, and, so far as I can see, but one, escape. The very hopelessness of the controversy shows that the reasoners have been transcending the limits of reason. They have reached a point where, as at the pole, the compass points indifferently to every quarter. Thus there is a chance that I may retain what is valuable in the chaos of speculation, and reject what is bewildering by confining the mind to its proper limits. But has any limit ever been suggested, except a limit which comes in substance to an exclusion of all ontology? In short, if I would avoid utter scepticism, must I not be an Agnostic?

Let us suppose, however, that this difficulty can be evaded. Suppose that, after calling witnesses from all schools and all ages, I can find ground for excluding all the witnesses who make against me. Let me say, for example, that the whole school which refuses to transcend experience errs from the wickedness of its heart and the consequent dulness of its intellect. Some people seem to think that a plausible and happy suggestion. Let the theologian have his necessary laws of thought, which enable him to evolve truth beyond all need of verification from experience. Where will the process end? The question answers itself. The path has been trodden again and again till it is as familiar as the first rule of arithmetic. Admit that the mind can reason about the Absolute and the Infinite, and you will get to Spinoza. No refutation of his arguments, starting from his premisses, has ever been even apparently successful. In fact, the chain of reasoning is substantially too short and simple to be for a moment doubtful. Theology, if logical, leads straight to Pantheism. The Infinite God is everything. All things are bound together as cause and effect. God, the first cause, is the cause of all effects down to the most remote. In one form or other, that is the conclusion to which all theology approximates as it is pushed to its legitimate result.

Here, then, we have an apparent triumph over Agnosticism. But nobody can accept Spinoza without rejecting all the doctrines for which the Gnostics really contend. In the first place, revelation and the God of revelation disappears. The argument according to Spinoza against supernaturalism differs from the argument according to Hume in being more peremptory. Hume only denies that a past miracle can be proved by evidence: Spinoza denies that it could ever have happened. As a fact, miracles and a local revelation were first assailed by Deists more effectually than by sceptics. The old Theology was seen to be unworthy of the God of nature, before it was said that nature could not be regarded through the theological representation. And, in the next place, the orthodox assault upon the value of Pantheism is irresistible. Pantheism can give no ground for morality, for nature is as much the cause of vice as the cause of virtue; it can give no ground for an optimist view of the universe, for nature causes evil as much as it causes good. We no longer doubt, it is true, whether there be a God, for our God means all reality; but every doubt which we entertained about the universe is transferred to the God upon whom the universe is moulded. The attempt to transfer to pure being or to the abstraction Nature the feelings with which we are taught to regard a person of transcendent wisdom and benevolence is, as theologians assert, hopeless. To deny the existence of God is in this sense the same as to deny the existence of no-God. We keep the old word; we have altered the whole of its contents. A Pantheist is, as a rule, one who looks upon the universe through his feelings instead of his reason, and who regards it with love because his habitual frame of mind is amiable. But he has no logical argument as against the Pessimist, who regards it with dread unqualified by love, or the Agnostic, who finds it impossible to regard it with any but a colourless emotion.

The Gnostic, then, gains nothing by admitting the claims of a faculty which at once overturns his conclusions. His second step is invariably to half-retract his first. We are bound by a necessary law of thought, he tells us, to believe in universal causation. Very well, then let us be Pantheists. No, he says; another necessary law of thought tells us that causation is not universal. We know that the will is free, or, in other words, that the class of phenomena most important to us are not caused. This is the position of the ordinary Deist; and it is of vital importance to him, for otherwise the connection between Deism and morality is, on his own ground, untenable. The ablest and most logical thinkers have declared that the freewill doctrine involves a fallacy, and have unravelled the fallacy to their own satisfaction. Whether right or wrong, they have at least this advantage, that, on their showing, reason is on this point consistent with itself. The advocate of freewill, on the

other hand, declares that an insoluble antinomy occurs at the very threshold of his speculations. An uncaused phenomenon is unthinkable; yet consciousness testifies that our actions, so far as they are voluntary, are uncaused. In face of such a contradiction, the only rational state of mind is scepticism. A mind balanced between two necessary and contradictory thoughts must be in a hopeless state of doubt. The Gnostic, therefore, starts by proclaiming that we must all be Agnostics in regard to a matter of primary philosophical importance. If by freewill he means anything else than a denial of causation, his statement is irrelevant.

For, it must be noticed, this is not one of the refined speculative problems which may be neglected in our ordinary reasoning. The ancient puzzles about the one and the many, or the infinite and the finite, may or may not be insoluble. They do not affect our practical knowledge. Familiar difficulties have been raised as to our conceptions of motion: the hare and tortoise problem may be revived by modern metaphysicians; but the mathematician may continue to calculate the movements of the planets and never doubt whether the quicker body will in fact overtake the slower. The freewill problem cannot be thus shirked. We all admit that a competent reasoner can foretell the motions of the moon; and we admit it because we know that there is no element of objective chance in the problem. But the determinist asserts whilst the libertarian denies that it would be possible for an adequate intelligence to foretell the actions of a man or a race. There is or is not an element of objective chance in the question; and whether there is or is not must be decided by reason and observation, independently of those puzzles about the infinite and the finite which affect equally the man and the planet. The anti-determinist asserts the existence of chance so positively, that he doubts whether God himself can foretell the future of humanity; or, at least he is unable to reconcile Divine prescience with his favourite doctrine.

In most practical questions, indeed, the difference is of little importance. The believer in freewill admits that we can make an approximate guess; the determinist admits that our faculty of calculation is limited. But when we turn to the problems with which the Gnostic desires to deal, the problem is of primary importance. Freewill is made responsible for all the moral evil in the world. God made man perfect, but he gave his creature freewill. The exercise of that freewill has converted the world into a scene in which the most striking fact, as Dr Newman tells us, is the absence of the Creator. It follows, then, that all this evil, the sight of which leads some of us to Atheism, some to blank despair, and some to epicurean indifference, and the horror of which is at the root of every vigorous religious creed, results from accident. If

even God could have foretold it, he foretold it in virtue of faculties inconceivable to finite minds; and no man, however exalted his faculties, could by any possibility have foretold it. Here, then, is Agnosticism in the highest degree. An inexorable necessity of thought makes it absolutely impossible for us to say whether this world is the anteroom to heaven or hell. We do not know, nay, it is intrinsically impossible for us to know, whether the universe is to be a source of endless felicity or a ghastly and everlasting torture-house. The Gnostic invites us to rejoice because the existence of an infinitely good and wise Creator is a guarantee for our happiness. He adds in the same breath that this good and wise being has left it to chance whether his creatures shall all, or in any proportion, go straight to the devil. He reviles the Calvinist, who dares to think that God has settled the point by his arbitrary will. Is an arbitrary decision better or worse than a trusting to chance? We know that there is a great First Cause; but we add that there are at this moment in the world some twelve hundred million little first causes which may damn or save themselves as they please.

The freewill hypothesis is the device by which theologians try to relieve God of the responsibility for the sufferings of his creation. It is required for another purpose. It enables the Creator to be also the judge. Man must be partly independent of God, or God would be at once pulling the wires and punishing the puppets. So far the argument is unimpeachable; but the device justifies God at the expense of making the universe a moral chaos. Grant the existence of this arbitrary force called freewill, and we shall be forced to admit that, if justice is to be found anywhere, it is at least not to be found in this strange anarchy, where chance and fate are struggling for the mastery.

The fundamental proposition of the anti-determinist, that which contains the whole pith and substance of his teaching, is this: that a determined action cannot be meritorious. Desert can only accrue in respect of actions which are self-caused, or in so far as they are self-caused; and self-caused is merely a periphrasis for uncaused. Now no one dares to say that our conduct is entirely self-caused. The assumption is implied in every act of our lives and every speculation about history that men's actions are determined, exclusively or to a great extent, by their character and their circumstances. Only so far as that doctrine is true can human nature be the subject of any reasoning whatever; for reason is but the reflection of external regularity, and vanishes with the admission of chance. Our conduct, then, is the resultant of the two forces which we may call fate and freewill. Fate is but a name for the will of God. He is responsible for placing us with a certain character in a certain position; he cannot justly punish us for the consequences; we are

responsible to him for the effects of our freewill alone, if freewill exists. That is the very contention of the anti-determinist; let us look for a moment at the consequences.

The ancient difficulty which has perplexed men since the days of Job is this: Why are happiness and misery arbitrarily distributed? Why do the good so often suffer and the evil so often flourish? The difficulty, says the determinist, arises entirely from applying the conception of justice where it is manifestly out of place. The advocate of freewill refuses this escape, and is perplexed by a further difficulty. Why are virtue and vice arbitrarily distributed? Of all the puzzles of this dark world, or of all forms of the one great puzzle, the most appalling is that which meets us at the corner of every street. Look at the children growing up amidst moral poison; see the brothel and the public-house turning out harlots and drunkards by the thousand; at the brutalized elders preaching cruelty and shamelessness by example; and deny, if you can, that lust and brutality are generated as certainly as scrofula and typhus. Nobody dares to deny it. All philanthropists admit it; and every hope of improvement is based on the assumption that the moral character is determined by its surroundings. What does the theological advocate of freewill say to reconcile such a spectacle with our moral conceptions? Will God damn all these wretches for faults due to causes as much beyond their power as the shape of their limbs or as the orbits of the planets? Or will he make some allowance, and decline to ask for grapes from thistles, and exact purity of life from beings born in corruption, breathing corruption, and trained in corruption? Let us try each alternative.

To Job's difficulty it has been replied that, though virtue is not always rewarded and vice punished, yet virtue *as such* is rewarded, and vice *as such* is punished. If that be true, God, on the freewill hypothesis, must be unjust. Virtue and vice, as the facts irresistibly prove, are caused by fate or by God's will as well as by freewill, that is, our own will. To punish a man brought up in a London slum by the rule applicable to a man brought up at the feet of Christ is manifestly the height of justice. Nay, for anything we can tell, for we know nothing of the circumstances of their birth and education, the effort which Judas Iscariot exerted in restoring the price of blood may have required a greater force of freewill than would have saved Peter from denying his master. Moll Flanders may put forth more power to keep out of the lowest depths of vice than a girl brought up in a convent to kill herself by ascetic austerities. If, in short, reward is proportioned to virtue, it cannot be proportioned to merit; for merit, by the hypothesis, is proportioned to the freewill, which is only one of the factors of virtue. The apparent injustice may, of course, be remedied by some un-

knowable compensation; but for all that appears, it is the height of injustice to reward equally equal attainments under entirely different conditions. In other words, the theologian has raised a difficulty from which he can only escape by the help of Agnosticism. Justice is not to be found in the visible arrangements of the universe.

Let us, then, take the other alternative. Assume that rewards are proportioned not to virtue but to merit. God will judge us by what we have done for ourselves, not by the tendencies which he has impressed upon us. The difficulty is disguised, for it is not diminished, and morality is degraded. A man should be valued, say all the deepest moralists, by his nature, not by his external acts; by what he is, not by how he came to be what he is. Virtue is heaven, and vice is hell. Divine rewards and punishments are not arbitrarily annexed, but represent the natural state of a being brought into harmony with the supreme law, or in hopeless conflict with it. We need a change of nature, not a series of acts unconnected with our nature. Virtue is a reality precisely in so far as it is a part of nature, not of accident; of our fate, not of our freewill. The assertion in some shape of these truths has been at the bottom of all great moral and religious reforms. The attempt to patch up some compromise between this and the opposite theory has generated those endless controversies about grace and freewill on which no Christian church has ever been able to make up its mind, and which warn us that we are once more plunging into Agnosticism. In order to make the Creator the judge, you assume that part of man's actions are his own. Only on that showing can he have merit as against his Maker. Admitting this, and only if we admit this, we get a footing for the debtor and creditor theories of morality—for the doctrine that man runs up a score with heaven in respect of that part of his conduct which is uncaused. Thus we have a ground for the various theories of merit by which priests have thriven and churches been corrupted; but it is at the cost of splitting human nature in two, and making happiness depend upon those acts which are not really part of our true selves.

It is not, however, my purpose to show the immorality or the unreasonableness of the doctrine. I shall only remark that it is essentially agnostic. Only in so far as phenomena embody fixed "laws" can we have any ground for inference in this world, and, *a fortiori*, from this world to the next. If happiness is the natural consequence of virtue, we may plausibly argue that the virtuous will be happy hereafter. If heaven be a bonus arbitrarily bestowed upon the exercise of an inscrutable power, all analogies break down. The merit of an action as between men depends upon the motives. The actions for which God rewards and punishes are the actions or those parts of actions which are independent of motive. Punish-

ment amongst men is regulated by some considerations of its utility to the criminal or his fellows. No conceivable measure of Divine punishment can even be suggested when once we distinguish between divine and natural; and the very essence of the theory is that such a distinction exists. For whatever may be true of the next world, we begin by assuming that new principles are to be called into play hereafter. The new world is summoned into being to redress the balance of the old. The fate which here too often makes the good miserable and the bad happy, which still more strangely fetters our wills and forces the strong will into wickedness and strengthens the weak will to goodness, will then be suspended. The motive which induces us to believe in the good arrangement hereafter is precisely the badness of this. Such a motive to belief cannot itself be a reason for belief. We believe because it is unreasonable. This world, once more, is a chaos, in which the most conspicuous fact is the absence of the Creator. Nay, it is so chaotic that, according to theologians, infinite rewards and penalties are required to square the account and redress the injustice here accumulated. What is this, so far as the natural reason is concerned, but the very superlative of Agnosticism? The appeal to experience can lead to nothing, for our very object is to contradict experience. We appeal to facts to show that facts are illusory. The appeal to *a priori* reason is not more hopeful, for you begin by showing that reason on these matters is self-contradictory, and you insist that human nature is radically irregular, and therefore beyond the sphere of reason. If you could succeed in deducing any theory by reason, reason would, on your showing, be at hopeless issue with experience.

There are two questions, in short, about the universe which must be answered to escape from Agnosticism. The great fact which puzzles the mind is the vast amount of evil. It may be answered that evil is an illusion, because God is benevolent; or it may be answered that evil is deserved, because God is just. In one case the doubt is removed by denying the existence of the difficulty, in the other it is made tolerable by satisfying our consciences. We have seen what natural reason can do towards justifying these answers. To escape from Agnosticism we become Pantheists; then the divine reality must be the counterpart of phenomenal nature, and all the difficulties recur. We escape from Pantheism by the illogical device of freewill. Then God is indeed good and wise, but God is no longer omnipotent. By his side we erect a fetish called freewill, which is potent enough to defeat all God's good purposes, and to make his absence from his own universe the most conspicuous fact given by observation; and which, at the same time, is by its own nature intrinsically arbitrary in its action. Your Gnosticism tells us that an almighty benevolence is watching over everything, and bringing good



out of all evil. Whence, then, comes the evil? By freewill; that is, by chance! It is an exception, an exception which covers, say, half the phenomena, and includes all that puzzle us. Say boldly at once no explanation can be given, and then proceed to denounce Agnosticism. If, again, we take the moral problem, the Pantheist view shows desert as before God to be a contradiction in terms. We are what he has made us; nay, we are but manifestations of himself—how can he complain? Escape from the dilemma by making us independent of God, and God, so far as the observed universe can tell us, becomes systematically unjust. He rewards the good and the bad, and gives equal reward to the free agent and the slave of fate. Where are we to turn for a solution?

Let us turn to revelation; that is the most obvious reply. By all means, though this is to admit that natural reason cannot help us; or, in other words, directly produces more Agnosticism, though indirectly it makes an opening for revelation. There is, indeed, a difficulty here. Pure theism, as we have observed, is in reality as vitally opposed to historical revelation as simple scepticism. The word God is used by the metaphysician and the savage. It may mean anything from "pure Being" down to the most degraded fetish. The "universal consent" is a consent to use the same phrase for antagonistic conceptions—for order and chaos, for absolute unity or utter heterogeneity, for a universe governed by a human will or by a will of which man cannot form the slightest conception. This is of course a difficulty which runs off the orthodox disputant like water from a duck's back. He appeals to his conscience, and his conscience tells him just what he wants. It reveals a Being just at that point in the scale between the two extremes which is convenient for his purposes. I open, for example, a harmless little treatise by a divine who need not be named. He knows intuitively, so he says, that there is a God, who is benevolent and wise, and endowed with personality, that is to say, conceived anthropomorphically enough to be capable of acting upon the universe, and yet so far different from man as to be able to throw a decent veil of mystery over his more questionable actions. Well, I reply, my intuition tells me of no such being. Then, says the divine, I can't prove my statements, but you would recognise their truth if your heart or your intellect were not corrupted: that is, you must be a knave or a fool. This is a kind of argument to which one is perfectly accustomed in theology. I am right, and you are wrong; and I am right because I am good and wise. By all means; and now let us see what your wisdom and goodness can tell us.

The Christian revelation makes statements which, if true, are undoubtedly of the very highest importance. God is angry with man. Unless we believe and repent we shall all be damned. It is

impossible, indeed, for its advocates even to say this without instantly contradicting themselves. Their doctrine frightens them. They explain in various ways that a great many people will be saved without believing, and that eternal damnation is not eternal nor damnation. It is only the vulgar who hold such views, and who, of course, must not be disturbed in them; but they are not for the intelligent. God grants "uncovenanted mercies"—that is, he sometimes lets a sinner off, though he has not made a legal bargain about it—an explanation calculated to exalt our conceptions of the Deity! But let us pass over these endless shufflings from the horrible to the meaningless. Christianity tells us in various ways how the wrath of the Creator may be appeased and his goodwill ensured. The doctrine is manifestly important to believers; but does it give us a clearer or happier view of the universe? That is what is required for the confusion of Agnostics; and, if the mystery were in part solved, or the clouds thinned in the slightest degree, Christianity would triumph by its inherent merits. Let us then ask once more, Does Christianity exhibit the ruler of their universe as benevolent or as just?

If I were to assert that of every ten beings born into this world nine would be damned, that all who refused to believe what they did not hold to be proved, and all who sinned from overwhelming temptation, and all who had not had the good fortune to be the subjects of a miraculous conversion or the recipients of a grace conveyed by a magical charm, would be tortured to all eternity, what would an orthodox theologian reply? He could not say, "That is false;" I might appeal to the highest authorities for my justification; nor, in fact, could he on his own showing deny the possibility. Hell, he says, exists; he does not know who will be damned; though he does know that all men are by nature corrupt and liable to be damned if not saved by supernatural grace. He might, and probably would, now say, "That is rash. You have no authority for saying how many will be lost and how many saved: you cannot even say what is meant by hell or heaven: you cannot tell how far God may be better than his word, though you may be sure that he won't be worse than his word." And what is all this but to say, We know nothing about it? In other words, to fall back on Agnosticism? The difficulty, as theologians truly say, is not so much that evil is eternal, as that evil exists. That is in substance a frank admission that, as nobody can explain evil, nobody can explain anything. Your revelation, which was to prove the benevolence of God, has proved only that God's benevolence may be consistent with the eternal and infinite misery of most of his creatures; you escape only by saying that it is also consistent with their not being eternally and infinitely miserable. That is, the revelation reveals nothing.

But the revelation shows God to be just. Now, if the freewill

hypothesis be rejected—and it is rejected not only by infidels but by the most consistent theologians—this question cannot really arise at all. Jonathan Edwards will prove that there cannot be a question of justice as between man and God. The creature has no rights against his Creator. The question of justice merges in the question of benevolence; and Edwards will go on to say that most men are damned, and that the blessed will thank God for their tortures. That is logical, but not consoling. Passing this over, can revelation prove that God is just, assuming that justice is a word applicable to dealings between the potter and the pot?

And here we are sent to the “great argument of Butler.” Like some other theological arguments already noticed, that great argument is to many minds—that of James Mill, for example—a direct assault upon Theism, or, in other words, an argument for Agnosticism. Briefly stated, it comes to this. The God of revelation cannot be the God of nature, said the Deists, because the God of revelation is unjust. The God of revelation, replied Butler, may be the God of nature, for the God of nature is unjust. Stripped of its various involutions, that is the sum and substance of this celebrated piece of reasoning. Butler, I must say in passing, deserves high credit for two things. The first is, that he is the only theologian who has ever had the courage to admit that any difficulty existed when he was struggling most desperately to meet the difficulty; though even Butler could not admit that such a difficulty should affect a man’s conduct. Secondly, Butler’s argument really rests upon a moral theory, mistaken indeed in some senses, but possessing a stoical grandeur. To admit, however, that Butler was a noble and a comparatively candid thinker, is not to admit that he ever faced the real difficulty. It need not be asked here by what means he evaded it. His position is in any case plain. Christianity tells us, as he thinks, that God damns men for being bad, whether they could help it or not; and that he lets them off, or lets some of them off, for the sufferings of others. He damns the helpless and punishes the innocent. Horrible! exclaims the infidel. Possibly, replies Butler, but nature is just as bad. All suffering is punishment. It strikes the good as well as the wicked. The father sins, and the son suffers. I drink too much, and my son has the gout. In another world, we may suppose that the same system will be carried out more thoroughly. God will pardon some sinners because he punished Christ, and he will damn others everlastingly. That is his way. A certain degree of wrongdoing here leads to irremediable suffering, or rather to suffering remediable by death alone. In the next world there is no death; therefore the suffering won’t be remediable at all. The world is a scene of probation, destined to fit us for a better life. As a matter of fact, most men make it a discipline of vice instead of a discipline of virtue; and most men, therefore, will presumably be damned. We see the same

thing in the waste of seeds and animal life, and may suppose, therefore, that it is part of the general scheme of Providence.

This is the Christian revelation according to Butler. Does it make the world better? Does it not rather add indefinitely to the terror produced by the sight of all its miseries, and justify James Mill for feeling that rather than such a God he would have no God? What escape can be suggested? The obvious one: it is all a mystery; and what is mystery but the theological phrase for Agnosticism? God has spoken and endorsed all our most hideous doubts. He has said, let there be light, and there is no light—no light but rather darkness visible, serving only to discover sights of woe.

The believers who desire to soften away the old dogmas—in other words, to take refuge from the unpleasant results of their doctrine with the Agnostics, and to retain the pleasant results with the Gnostics—have a different mode of escape. They know that God is good and just; that evil will somehow disappear and apparent injustice be somehow redressed. The practical objection to this amiable creed suggests a sad comment upon the whole controversy. We fly to religion to escape from our dark forebodings. But a religion which stifles those forebodings always fails to satisfy us. We long to hear that they are groundless. Directly we are told that they are groundless, we distrust our authority. No poetry lives which reflects only the cheerful emotions. Our sweetest songs are those which tell of saddest thought. We can bring harmony out of melancholy; we cannot banish melancholy from the world. And the religious utterances, which are the highest form of poetry, are bound by the same law. There is a deep sadness in the world. Turn and twist the thought as you may, there is no escape. Optimism would be soothing if it were possible; in fact, it is impossible, and therefore a constant mockery; and of all dogmas that ever were invented, that which has least vitality is the dogma that whatever is, is right.

Let us, however, consider for a moment what is the net result of this pleasant creed. Its philosophical basis may be sought in pure reason or in experience; but, as a rule, its adherents are ready to admit that the pure reason requires the support of the emotions before such a doctrine can be established, and are therefore marked by a certain tinge of mysticism. They feel rather than know. The awe with which they regard the universe, the tender glow of reverence and love with which the bare sight of nature affects them, is to them the ultimate guarantee of their beliefs. Happy those who feel such emotions! Only when they try to extract definite statements of fact from these impalpable sentiments they should beware how far such statements are apt to come into terrible collision with reality. And, meanwhile, those who have been disabused with *Candide*, who

have felt the weariness and pain of all "this unintelligible world," and have not been able to escape into any mystic rapture, have as much to say for their own version of the facts. Is happiness a dream, or misery; or is it all a dream? Does not our answer vary with our health and with our condition? When, rapt in the security of a happy life, we cannot even conceive that our happiness will fail, we are practical optimists. When some random blow out of the dark crushes the pillars round which our life has been entwined as recklessly as a boy sweeps away a cobweb, when at a single step we plunge through the flimsy crust of happiness into the deep gulphs beneath, we are tempted to turn to pessimism. Who shall decide, and how? Of all questions that can be asked, the most important is surely this: Is the tangled web of this world composed chiefly of happiness or of misery? and of all questions that can be asked, it is surely the most unanswerable. For in no other problem is the difficulty of discarding the illusions arising from our own experience, of eliminating "the personal error" and gaining an outside standing-point, so hopeless.

In any case, the real appeal must be to experience. Ontologists may manufacture libraries of jargon without touching the point. They have never made or suggested the barest possibility of making a bridge from the world of pure reason to the contingent world in which we live. To the thinker who tries to construct the universe out of pure reason, the actual existence of error in our minds and disorder in the outside world presents a difficulty as hopeless as that which the existence of vice and misery presents to the optimist who tries to construct the universe out of pure goodness. To say that misery does not exist is to contradict the primary testimony of consciousness; to argue on *à priori* grounds that misery or happiness predominates is as hopeless a task as to deduce from the principle of the excluded middle the distance from St. Paul's to Westminster Abbey. Questions of fact can only be solved by examining facts. Perhaps such evidence would show, and if a guess were worth anything, I should add that I guess that it would show, that happiness predominates over misery in the composition of the known world. I am, therefore, not prejudiced against the Gnostic's conclusion; but I add that the evidence is just as open to me as to him. The whole world in which we live may be an illusion—a veil to be withdrawn in some higher state of being. But be it what it may, it supplies all the evidence upon which we can rely. If evil predominates here, we have no reason to suppose that good predominates elsewhere. All the ingenuity of theologians can never shake our conviction that facts are what we feel them to be, nor invert the plain inference from facts, and facts are just as open to one school of thought as to another.

What, then, is the net result? One insoluble doubt has haunted men's minds since thought began in the world. No answer has ever been suggested. One school of philosophers hands it to the next. It is denied in one form only to reappear in another. The question is not which system excludes the doubt, but how it expresses the doubt. Admit or deny the competence of reason in theory, we all agree that it fails in practice. Theologians revile reason as much as Agnostics; they then appeal to it and it decides against them. They amend their plea by excluding certain questions from its jurisdiction, and those questions include the whole difficulty. They go to revelation, and revelation replies by calling doubt mystery. They declare that their consciousness declares just what they want it to declare. Ours declares something else. Who is to decide? The only appeal is to experience, and to appeal to experience is to admit the fundamental dogma of Agnosticism.

Is it not, then, the very height of audacity, in face of a difficulty, which meets us at every turn, which has perplexed all the ablest thinkers in proportion to their ability, which vanishes in one shape only to show itself in another, to declare roundly, not only that the difficulty can be solved, but that it does not exist? Why, when no honest man will deny in private that every ultimate problem is wrapped in the profoundest mystery, do honest men proclaim in pulpits that unhesitating certainty is the duty of the most foolish and ignorant? Is it not a spectacle to make the angels laugh? We are a company of ignorant beings, feeling our way through mists and darkness, learning only by incessantly repeated blunders, obtaining a glimmering of truth by falling into every conceivable error, dimly discerning light enough for our daily needs, but hopelessly differing whenever we attempt to describe the ultimate origin or end of our paths; and yet, when one of us ventures to declare that we don't know the map of the universe as well as the map of our infinitesimal parish, he is hooted, reviled, and perhaps told that he will be damned to all eternity for his faithlessness. Amidst all the endless and hopeless controversies which have left nothing but bare husks of meaningless words, we have been able to discover certain reliable truths. They don't take us very far, and the condition of discovering them has been distrust of *a priori* guesses, and the systematic interrogation of experience. Let us, say some of us, follow at least this clue. Here we shall find sufficient guidance for the needs of life, though we renounce for ever the attempt to get behind the veil which no one has succeeded in raising; if, indeed, there be anything behind. You miserable Agnostics! is the retort; throw aside such rubbish, and cling to the old husks. Stick to the words which profess to explain everything; call your doubts mysteries and they won't disturb you any longer; and

believe in those necessary truths of which no two philosophers have ever succeeded in giving the same version.

Gentlemen, we can only reply, wait till you have some show of agreement amongst yourselves. Wait till you can give some answer, not palpably a verbal answer, to some one of the doubts which oppress us as they oppress you. Wait till you can point to some single truth, however trifling, which has been discovered by your method, and will stand the test of discussion and verification. Wait till you can appeal to reason without in the same breath vilifying reason. Wait till your divine revelations have something more to reveal than the hope that the hideous doubts which they suggest may possibly be without foundation. Till then, we shall be content to admit openly what you whisper under your breath or hide in technical jargon, that the ancient secret is a secret still; that man knows nothing of the Infinite and Absolute; and that, knowing nothing, he had better not be dogmatic about his ignorance. And, meanwhile, we will endeavour to be as charitable as possible, and whilst you trumpet forth officially your contempt for our scepticism, we will at least try to believe that you are imposed upon by your own bluster.

LESLIE STEPHEN.

## JAMES NORTHCOTE, R.A.

In his *Life of Reynolds*, Northcote tells an interesting story of the great painter. Soon after he came to London, he went to a picture sale. The room was crowded, the business was going on briskly. Suddenly, there was a pause, a flutter at the door, and then the company divided, to make a lane for a great man to approach the auctioneer's rostrum. The great man was Mr. Pope. As he passed up the room he shook hands with the persons nearest him. Reynolds, who was in the second rank, put out his hand, the poet took it, and Sir Joshua used to relate in after-life that this was the only time he saw Mr. Pope, and how much he treasured the memory of that shake of the hand. In the same book, Northcote tells a somewhat similar story of himself. When he was a boy of sixteen, Sir Joshua Reynolds and Dr. Johnson came on a visit to Plymouth. It was in 1762. "It was about this time," he says, "that I first saw Sir Joshua. I had seen several of his works which were in Plymouth (for at that time I had never been out of the county), and these pictures filled me with wonder and delight, although I was then very young; insomuch that I remember when Reynolds was pointed out to me at a public meeting, where a great crowd were assembled, I got as near to him as I could from the pressure of the people, to touch the skirt of his coat, which I did with great satisfaction to my mind." It was a genuine case of hero-worship, which lasted throughout Northcote's life. He begins at sixteen with touching the skirts of Sir Joshua's coat; seventy years afterwards, when he is dying of old age, almost his last words are praises of Sir Joshua.

There was a long interval, however, between this first contact with Reynolds and the close association with him which afterwards marked the lives of the two painters. Northcote had to struggle very hard with adverse fortune, narrow means, and restricted opportunities. His father was a watch and clock-maker in Market Street, Plymouth Dock. He was poor—so poor indeed, that, as Allan Cunningham relates, it was said by the members of a little club to which he belonged, that in his supper with them he took his dinner. James, his second son, was born on the 22nd of October, 1746. Even in boyhood he had a liking for painting, but as this taste developed, it was repressed by the elder Northcote, who intended the lad to be his own apprentice. He was a dissenter, too—a Unitarian—and in those days, Art did not stand well in the estimation of persons of his class or creed. Besides, he had views of life, and made estimates of character. "My father used to say," Northcote tells us, "that there were people of premature ability



who soon ran to seed. He had known several who were very clever at seventeen or eighteen, but who turned out nothing afterwards; at that time of life the effervescence and intoxication of youth did a great deal, but we required to wait till the gaiety and dance of the animal spirits subsided, to see what people really were." Whatever his motive, the old man made Northcote wait. He apprenticed him to the watch-making, and allowed him to paint only in the evening and morning hours of leisure. Northcote submitted, and persevered. He served out his term of apprenticeship, and continued to work at his father's business until he was twenty-four years old—painting, meanwhile, as much as he could; confining himself chiefly to portraits, and studies of animals.

In 1771 his chance came to him. His portraits were talked about in Plymouth; people spoke of him as a prodigy; and then Dr. Mudge, the friend of Reynolds and of Johnson, encouraged him to go to London to see Sir Joshua, giving him a letter of introduction for that purpose. Northcote went at once. It is said that he walked the whole distance from Plymouth to London; and it would seem that at first he made little progress in his great desire. Reynolds shook his head at the crude performances of the young man, and Northcote had to seek employment—that of colouring prints of flowers at a shilling a sheet—to get bread. He was persevering, and did it, contriving to improve his knowledge of Art at the same time, until Reynolds, struck with his determination, took him as a pupil and assistant, not only into his studio, but as a resident in his house.

"It was in the year 1771," says Northcote (in his *Life of Reynolds*), "that I was first placed under the tuition of Sir Joshua Reynolds, to whom I was introduced and strongly recommended by my good and much respected friend, Dr. John Mudge. I feel it next to impossible to express the pleasure I received in breathing, if it may be so said, in an atmosphere of Art; and as from the earliest period of my being able to make any observation, I had conceived him to be the greatest painter that ever lived, it may be conjectured what I felt when I found myself in his house as his scholar."

It was a good house to be in: a house in which there was the best Art and the best company—Johnson, and Goldsmith, and Burke, and Garrick; the wits and the poets, politicians and painters, rank and fashion, and, above all, Sir Joshua himself, sovereign in Art, polished in manners, capable of holding his ground alike with men of fashion and men of letters.

Here Northcote remained for five years, treated, he tells us, quite as one of the family. Sir Joshua appreciated his earnestness and industry, encouraged his studies, both at home and in the schools of the Academy, and relished his sharp outspoken comments and retorts. In his *Century of Painters* Mr. Redgrave says that Northcote, in his apprenticeship to Reynolds, "had full opportunity of acquiring the

technical knowledge he must have so greatly needed. He stood beside Reynolds before his easel, he enjoyed free converse with him, he saw his works in all stages, he assisted in their progress, laying in draperies, painting backgrounds and accessories, and forwarding the numerous duplicates and copies required of such a master, and he shared the usual means of advancement and study enjoyed by Reynolds's pupils; at the same time he did not neglect the essential study of the figure at the Royal Academy." Northcote himself, in the *Life of Reynolds* and in his *Conversations*, gives a somewhat different account. He worked with Reynolds, no doubt, and derived benefit from the association; but he complains that Sir Joshua was a bad master, that he taught him nothing directly, would not allow him to use any but the commonest preparations, and locked up his own colours. "He would not suffer me," Northcote says, "during the whole time I resided in his house, to make use of any other materials than the common preparations of colour, just as we have them from the hands of the colourman; and all varnishes, and every kind of experiment, were strictly prohibited. Likewise, all his own preparations of colour were most carefully concealed from my sight and knowledge, and perpetually locked secure in his drawers, thus never to be seen or known by any one but himself." Sometimes, however, Reynolds gave him a sharp lesson in practice. "It was very provoking," Northcote writes, "after I had been for hours labouring on the drapery of one of his portraits, from a lay figure, to see him, with a few masterly sweeps of his brush, destroy nearly all my work, and turn it into something much finer," and yet, he adds, with a touch of pride, "but for my work it would not have been what it was." Copying pictures, though unquestionably useful to him, Northcote detested. "It is," he says, "like plain work among women; it is what anybody can do, and therefore nothing but a bare living is to be got from it." Occasionally he tried to argue with Reynolds, and got put down. Criticising some directions as to colour, given by a visitor, Sir Joshua replied, "He is a sensible man, but an indifferent colourist. There is not a man on earth who has the least notion of colouring: we all of us have it equally to seek for and find out, as at present it is totally lost to the art." Notwithstanding this rebuff, Northcote ventured to advise Reynolds himself:—

"I once humbly endeavoured to persuade Sir Joshua to abandon those fleeting colours, lake and carmine, which it was his practice to use in painting the flesh, and to adopt vermilion in their stead, as infinitely more durable, although perhaps not so exactly true to nature as the former; I remember he looked on his hand, and said, 'I can see no vermilion in flesh.' I replied, 'But did not Sir Godfrey Kneller always use vermilion in his flesh colour?' Sir Joshua answered rather sharply, 'What signifies what a man uses, who could not colour? You may use it if you will.'"

Of Northcote's imitative art, Sir Joshua had a high opinion. North-

cote painted a portrait of one of the maid-servants. The likeness was recognised by a macaw belonging to Sir Joshua; the bird disliked the woman, and flew right at the face of the portrait, and tried to bite it. Failing here, he struck at the hand. The experiment was often repeated for the amusement of visitors. Of his own work at that time, Northcote had not formed a very high estimate. Many years afterwards he told Hazlitt how keenly he noted the failures of other pupils in the Academy,—

"The glaring defects of such works almost disgusted me with the profession. Is this, I said, what the art is made up of? How do I know that my own productions may not appear in the same light to others? Nothing gave me the horrors so much as passing the old battered portraits at the doors of brokers' shops, with the morning sun shining full upon them. I was generally inclined to prolong my walk, and put off painting for that day; but the sight of a fine picture had a contrary effect, and I went back and set to work with redoubled ardour."

The direct connection between Reynolds and Northcote ended in 1775, when Northcote was twenty-nine years old. They parted on good terms, Reynolds saying that Northcote had been very useful to him, more so than any other scholar that had ever been with him, and adding, "I hope we shall assist each other as long as we live." Northcote now went back to Plymouth for a time, and painted portraits until he had made enough money to fulfil his purpose—that of going to Italy to study the great masters—to steal from them, as he afterwards described the process. He spent three years in Italy, not knowing a word of the language, or indeed of any language but his own. This proved no hindrance. He said to Hazlitt, speaking of this journey, "there may be sin in Rome, as in all great capitals, but in Parma, and the remoter towns, they seem all one family. Their kindness to strangers is great. I travelled from Lyons to Genoa, and from Genoa to Rome, without speaking a word of the language, and in the power of a single person, without meeting with the smallest indignity; everywhere, both in inns and on the road, every attention was paid to my feelings, and pains taken to make me comfortable." In the *Conversations* Hazlitt sums up Northcote's impressions of this period,—

"He spoke of his journey to Italy, of the beauty of the climate, of the manners of the people, of the imposing effect of the Roman Catholic religion, of its favourableness to the fine arts, of the churches full of pictures, of the manner in which he passed his time, studying and looking into all the rooms in the Vatican. He had no fault to find with Italy, and no wish to leave it. Gracious and sweet was all he saw in her. As he talked (this was when he was an old man of eighty) he looked as if he saw the different objects pass before him, and his eyes glistened with familiar recollections. He said, 'Raffaello did not scorn to look out of himself, or to be beholden to others; he took whole figures from Masaccio to enrich his designs, because all he wanted was to advance the art, and to ennoble human nature.' 'Everything at Rome,' he said, 'is like a picture, is calculated for show. I remember walking through one of the by-streets near the Vatican, where I met some procession in which

the Pope was ; and all at once I saw a number of the most beautiful Arabian horses curvetting and throwing out their long tails like a vision, or part of a romance. All our pageants are Bartholomew Fair exhibitions compared with what you see at Rome. And then, to see the Pope give the benediction at St. Peter's, raising himself up, and spreading out his hands in the form of a cross, with an energy and dignity as if he was giving a blessing to the whole world ! ”

Raffaelle, Titian, and Michael Angelo—the last-named especially—were the great objects of attraction to him. He told Reynolds, on his return, “ For once that I went to look at Raffaelle, I went twice to look at Michael.” He made good use of those studies. You must use the great masters, not imitate them : that was his conclusion. It is easy, he says, to imitate one of the old masters, but repetitions are useless.

“ If you want to last, you must invent something. To do otherwise is only pouring liquor from one vessel into another ; that becomes staler every time. We are tired of the antique ; the world wants something new, and will have it ; no matter whether it be better or worse, if there is but an infusion of new life and spirit, it will go down to posterity. There is Michael Angelo, how utterly different from the antique, and in some things how superior ! There is his statue of Cosmo de Medici leaning on his hand, in the chapel of San Lorenzo, at Florence. I declare it has that look of reality in it, that it almost terrifies one to be near it. Is it not the same with Titian, Correggio, and Raffaelle ? These painters did not imitate one another, but were as unlike as possible, and yet were all excellent. Originality is neither caprice nor affectation. It is an excellence that is always to be found in Nature, but has never had a place in Art before.”

Northcote, as this passage shows, was a sound critic. He could also describe a fine picture so as to bring it bodily before us. Speaking of Titian, he said to Hazlitt :—

“ There is that fine one which you have heard me speak of—Paul the Third, and his two natural sons, or nephews, as they are called. My God ! what a look it has. The old man is sitting in his chair, and looking up to one of the sons, with his hands grasping the arm-chair with his long spider fingers, and seems to say, as plain as words can speak, ‘ You wretch, what do you want now ? ’ while the young fellow is advancing with a humble, hypocritical air. It is true history, and indeed it turned out so, for the son (or nephew) was afterwards thrown out of the palace windows by the mob, and torn to pieces by them.”

Here is another criticism, on Velasquez,—

“ When a work seems stamped on the canvas by a blow, you are taken by surprise, and your admiration is as instantaneous and electrical as the impulse of genius which has caused it. I have seen a whole-length portrait by Velasquez, that seemed done while the colours were yet wet ; everything was touched in, as it were, by a wish ; there was such a power, that it thrilled through your whole frame, and you felt as if you could take up the brush and do anything.”

A criticism of Titian's portraits is worth recalling. Hazlitt gives it in the *Conversations*.

“ He mentioned his going with Prince Hoare and Day to take leave of some fine portraits by Titian, that hung in a dark corner of a gallery at Naples, and as Day looked at them for the last time, with tears in his eyes, he said, ‘ Ah ! he was a fine old *monner*. ’ I said I had repeated this expression (which I had

heard him allude to before), somewhere in writing, and was surprised that people did not know what to make of it. Northcote said, 'Why that is exactly what I should have thought. There is the difference between writing and speaking. In writing you address the average quantity of sense or information in the world; in speaking, you pick your audience, or at least know what they are prepared for, or else previously explain what you think necessary. You understand the epithet, because you have seen a great number of Titian's pictures, and know that cat-like, watchful, penetrating look he gives to all his faces, which nothing else expresses, perhaps, so well as the phrase Day made use of; but the world in general knows nothing of this; all they know or believe is, that Titian is a great painter, like Raffaele or any other famous person.'

Some painters are as little impressed as the world in general, by the glories of Italian Art. Romney and Edwards were in Italy, and went to the Sistine Chapel. Edwards, Northcote says, "turned on his heel and exclaimed, 'Egad, George, we're *bit*!'"

While Northcote gained inconceivably in Art by his Italian journey, he lost little or nothing in purse. He was very thrifty. Allan Cunningham, in his *Lives of the Painters*, sketches his way of living when abroad.

"I have heard that as necessity and Nature united in making him economical, he lived meanly; associated with none who were likely to lead him into expenses; and as he copied for dealers or travellers a number of the favourite works of the Italian masters, he improved his skill of hand, and rather increased than diminished the sum with which he started from England. Common apartments, common clothes, and common food sufficed for one who was too proud to ask aid from any source, and who had resolved to be independent."

His powers as an artist were recognised, however, by others than dealers. The Italian artists elected him a member of the academies of Florence, Cortona, and Rome. Thus fortified in mind, reputation, and purse, Northcote returned to England, and settled for a time in Devonshire, but removed in 1781 to London, where he took a house in Old Bond Street, with the resolution of combining portraiture and historical painting, making the money earned by the one provide leisure for the other.

He met with discouragement at the beginning of his career. Reynolds told him, half playfully, that there was not much chance. "Ah! my dear sir, you may go back; there is a wondrous Cornishman who is carrying all before him." This was Opie, lately come to London, under the auspices of Dr. Wolcot, best known as Peter Pindar. "What is he like?" asked Northcote. "Like? why like Caravaggio and Velasquez in one." Northcote was a prudent man; he resolved to be on friendly terms with the Cornish wonder, and friends they became, though they were commonly considered rivals in painting. Mrs. Opie's letters bear testimony to Northcote's intimacy with her husband. She quotes, with manifest satisfaction, Northcote's observation, that "while other artists painted to live, Opie lived to paint." Seeking to harass Opie, Northcote said, "You did not know

Opie. You would have admired him greatly. I do not speak of him as an artist, but as a man of sense and observation. He paid me the compliment of saying that we should have been the best friends in the world if we had not been rivals. I think he had more of this feeling than I had; perhaps because I had most vanity." Northcote, however, had the feeling of rivalry pretty strongly. In 1787 Opie and he were elected full members of the Academy. Northcote exhibited his picture—perhaps his best work—*Wat Tyler*, now in the Guildhall. Opie exhibited his chief work, the *Murder of Rizzio*, now also in the Guildhall. While the works were in progress, Northcote went to see Opie's picture. He found it better and more advanced than his own.

"When I returned to my painting-room, I took up my palette and pencils with an inveterate determination to do something that should raise me a name; but my inspiration was only a momentary dream. The ghost of that picture stood between me and my blank canvas. I could see nothing but the murderers of Rizzio. I felt I could have rejoiced if they had seized the painter and murdered him instead. Yes, I could. This dwelt upon my fancy until I laughed at the conceit, for, thought I, then there had been a meddling fiddler and rival painter dispatched at the same expense; and if all the fiddlers and painters were smothered, for aught I know they might well be spared. I dreamed of the picture whilst wide awake, and I dreamed of the picture when fast asleep. How could I help it? There was a passage in the composition wherein the torches—for the scene was represented, as 'ee may remember, by torchlight, and it was the finest trait of effect that ever proceeded from mortal hand. I still dwelt upon it in my mind's eye, in sheer despair. To attempt anything so original, so gloriously fine, I might as well have set about creating another world. I should have died, but for a fortuitous circumstance. I called again to see the hated picter. 'Well, my dear friend,' asked Hazlitt, 'and how did you feel?' 'How did I feel? Gude God! I would not have had Opie know what was passing in my mind for all the world; no, not even to have been the author of the picture. Judge, if 'ee can, what I felt. Why, some wretch, some demon had persuaded him to alter the whole structure of the piece. He had adopted the fatal advice, had destroyed the glory of the Art, and ruined—yes, to my solace—irrecoverably ruined the piece."

Candid, this; but Northcote was candid. When Opie died, in 1807, they feared to tell Northcote, lest he should be too greatly shocked. There need have been no such alarm. "Well, well," he said, "it's a very sad event; but I must confess it takes a great stumbling-block out of my way, for I never could succeed where Opie did."

In this endeavour to sketch the character of Northcote it is needless to dwell at length upon his pictures. It is said that he painted altogether about two thousand works—portraits, historical, and scriptural pieces, subjects from home life, and studies of animals, in the last of which he excelled. The best known of his larger works are the gallery pictures painted for Alderman Boydell. The engravings afford sufficient means to judge of them. They are powerful in parts, but are exaggerated in attitude, and generally too careless in composition, and, like all other works of that period, utterly

defiant of propriety in costume and other accessories. He was thinking of Michael Angelo, and aiming at the grand style; but the grand style proved too large for him—it needed the hand of a great master.

The man himself, however, is a more interesting study than his works. He lived so long and his life covered so great a period—from 1746 to 1831—that he became a sort of institution, a depositary of Art traditions, professional and personal, of the most varied and amusing kind. These he loved to narrate in his own dry, cynical way, for he was an admirable talker. In person he was very short, in dress very careless—his trousers were commonly too long, and his shoes too large,—and in habits penurious to miserliness. By saving, and pinching, and screwing, he accumulated more than £40,000—a large fortune in days when prices were so much lower than they are now. One of Fuseli's sarcasms points this phase in his character. Somebody said that Northcote was going to keep a dog. "Northcote keep a dog!" exclaimed Fuseli; "why, what will he feed him on? He will have to eat his own fleas!" Something had occurred at the Academy to gratify Northcote: "Now," said Fuseli, "he will go home, put more coals on the fire, and almost draw the cork of his only pint of wine." When the exhibition of old masters was begun at the British Institution, a scurrilous publication, called "The Catalogue Raisonné," was issued; it was presumed in the interests of the Academy. Haydon writes, as a departure from Northcote's ordinary habits, that he "ordered a long candle, and went to bed to read it in ecstasy." Notwithstanding his niggardliness and his biting sarcasm, Northcote's studio was for many years a common resort. "About eleven o'clock" (I quote Mr. Redgrave), "unless he had a sitter, a sort of levée commenced. It seldom happened that he remained long alone—one succeeded another, occasionally three or four at a time; and he talked over his work till his dinner-hour, freely discussing any subject which arose, with great sagacity, acuteness, and information, and always maintaining his own opinions."

Haydon in his Autobiography mentions Northcote more than once. This is an entry in 1807:—

"On the day the exhibition opened, we all dined with Hoppner, who hated Northcote, who in his turn hated Hoppner. We talked of Art, and after dinner Hoppner said, 'I can fancy a man fond of his art who painted like Reynolds; but how a man can be fond of Art who paints like that fellow Northcote, Heaven only knows.'"

In 1821, in a sketch of the sale of Reynolds's pictures, Haydon again introduces Northcote. The former had induced Mr. (afterwards Sir George) Phillips to buy Reynolds's *Piping Shepherd* for four hundred guineas, then a very large price.

"The purchase," he says, "made a great noise in town, and Phillips was assailed by everybody as he came in. I soon found it was considered by the

artists a sort of honour to be near him, and in the midst of the sale up squeezed Chantrey. I was exceedingly amused. I turned round and found on the other side, Northcote! I began to think something was in the wind. Phillips asked him how he liked the 'Shepherd Boy.' At first he did not recollect it, and then said, 'Ah! indeed! Ah! yes! it was a very poor thing. I remember it.' Poor Mr. Phillips whispered to me, 'You see people have different tastes.' I knew that Northcote's coming up was ominous of something. The attempts of this little fellow to mortify others are quite amusing: he exists upon it. The sparkling delight with which he watches a face when he knows that something is coming that will change its expression, is beyond everything; and as soon as he had said what he thought would make Phillips unhappy for two hours, he slunk away."

Again, in 1825, Haydon has another fling at Northcote, now an old man of eighty, and who might well have been spared:—

"While I was at the Gallery yesterday, poor old Northcote, who has some fine pictures there, was walking about. He nodded to me. I approached. I congratulated him on his pictures. 'Ah! sir,' said he, 'they want varnishing, they say.' 'Well,' said I, 'why don't you varnish them?' He shook his head, meaning he was too feeble. 'Shall I do it?' 'Will 'ee?' said Northcote. 'I shall be so much obliged.' To the astonishment of the Academicians, I mounted the ladder and varnished away. The poor old mummy was in raptures. I felt for the impotence of his age. He told me some capital stories when I came down."

Readers of Northcote's Conversations know well enough that "the poor old mummy" revenged himself amply on Haydon. In Leslie's Recollections we have an equally graphic, but kindlier notice of Northcote:—

"It is the etiquette for a newly elected member to call immediately on all the Academicians, and I did not omit paying my respects to Northcote among the rest, although I knew he was not on good terms with the Academy. I was shown up-stairs into a large front room filled with pictures, many of the larger ones resting against each other, and all of them dim with dust. I had not waited long when a door opened which communicated with his painting room, and the old gentleman appeared, but did not advance beyond it. His diminutive figure was enveloped in a chintz dressing-gown, below which his trousers, which looked as if made for a much larger man, hung in immense folds over a loose pair of shoes, into which his legs seemed to have shrunk down. His head was covered with a blue silk night-cap, and from under that, and his projecting brows, his sharp black eyes peered at me with a whimsical expression of inquiry. There he stood, with his palette and brushes in one hand, and a mahl-stick, twice as long as himself, in the other: his attitude and look saying, for he did not speak—'What do you want?' On telling him that I had been elected an Associate of the Academy, he said, quickly, 'And who's the other?' 'Mr. Clint,' I replied. 'And so Clint's got it at last. You're an architect, I believe?' I set him right, and he continued, 'Well, sir, you owe nothing to me; I never go near them; indeed, I never go out at night anywhere.' I told him I knew that, but thought it right to pay my respects to all the Academicians, and hoped I was not interrupting him. He said 'By no means,' and asked me into his painting room, where he was at work on an equestrian picture of George IV. as large as life, which he must have made up from busts and pictures. 'I was desirous,' he said, 'to paint the King, for there is no picture that is like him, and he is by far the best King of his family we have had. It has been remarked that this country is best governed by a woman, for then the Government is carried on by able men; and George IV. is like a woman, for he minds only his own amusements, and



leaves the affairs of the country to his ministers, instead of meddling himself, as his father did. He is just what a King of England should be—something to look grand, and to hang the robes on.' I asked leave to repeat my visit, which was readily granted, and from that time we were very good friends. He talked better than he painted."

Leslie continues :—

"When I first found myself painting in the exhibition rooms of the Royal Academy, where most of its members were at work, retouching their pictures, I was a good deal puzzled at the very opposite advice I received from authorities equally high. Northcote came in, and it was the only time I ever saw him at the Academy. He had a large picture there, and not hung in the best of places, at which he was much dissatisfied. I told him of my difficulties, and that Wilkie and Lawrence had just given me extraordinary advice. 'Everybody,' he said, 'will advise you to do what he himself would do, but you are to consider and judge for yourself whether you are likely to do it as he would, and if not you may spoil your picture.'

"Northcote then complained to Phillips of the ill-usage he had received from the Academy, and said, 'I have scarcely ever had a picture well hung. I wish I had never belonged to you.' Phillips said, laughing, 'We can turn you out!' Northcote answered, 'The sooner you do so the better; only think of the men you *have* turned out. You turned out Sir Joshua, you turned out Barry, and you turned out West; and I shall be very glad to make a fourth in such company.'

"Mr. Shee, with the adroitness which was natural to him, paid him some compliments. Northcote said, 'Very well, indeed. You are just the man to write a tragedy' (Shee was a very indifferent poet), 'you know how to make a speech.' At another time Northcote complimented Shee in his own peculiar manner, by saying, 'You should have been in Parliament, instead of the Academy.'

Another painter—Thomas Bewicke, the pupil of Haydon—records in his journals a visit to Northcote shortly before his death. Bewicke had been sent to Rome by Sir Thomas Lawrence, to copy some of Michael Angelo's figures in the Sistine Chapel. On his return, he went to show his drawings to Northcote.

"An old servant, almost blind, who had lived with him for half a century, and who had been ordered to leave scores of times, but would not go, opened the door. I sent in my card, and was ushered into the miser's study. I found him alone, dressed in an old dingy green dressing-gown, and cap to match. He received me very graciously, and when I told him I had just returned from Italy, he opened his eyes with amazement. I said I had brought my drawing of Jeremiah to show him. I then unrolled the drawing, and he, holding up his hands, said, 'Ah! wonderful—strange! How grand. Ah! sir, Raffaele and Michael Angelo were grand fellows—we are puny and meagre compared with them, and I fear ever shall be. The style of education in the Arts is so effeminate, if I may so speak, in this country.' Then, in a sententious manner, he added, 'No, sir, they will never be able to comprehend the grandeur of Michael Angelo; you may show Jeremiah upside down for the next century, and no one will see the difference.'

One more quotation—from Hazlitt, the 'closest friend and intimate of Northcote's closing years :—

"Talking with Northcote is like conversing with the dead. You see a little old man, eighty years of age, pale and fragile, with eyes gleaming like the lights that are hung in tombs. He seems little better than a ghost, is almost

as insubstantial, and hangs wavering and trembling on the very edge of life. You would think that a breath would blow him away; and yet, what fine things he says. 'Yes,' observed some one, 'and what ill-natured things: they are all malicious to the last word.' Lamb called him, 'A little bottle of aqua-fortis, which, you know, corrodes everything it touches.' 'Except gold,' interrupted Hazlitt; 'he never drops upon Sir Joshua or the great masters.' 'Well,' persisted the other, 'but is he not flowing over with envy, and hatred, and all uncharitableness? I am told that he is as spiteful as a woman. Then his niggardness! Did he ever give anything away?' 'Yes,' retorted Hazlitt, 'his advice; and very unpleasant it is!' At another time the conversation turned upon the living painters, when one of them (Haydon, I think) was praised as being a capital relater of an anecdote. This brought Hazlitt's thoughts to Northcote, of whom he spoke again—'He is the best teller of a story I ever knew. He will bring up an old defunct anecdote, that has not a jot of merit, and make it quite delightful by dishing it up in his own words: they are quite a *sauce piquante*.' 'All he says is very well,' said some one, 'when it touches only our neighbour; but what if he speaks of one's self?' 'You must take your chance of that,' replied Hazlitt; 'but, provided you are not a rival, and will let him alone, he will not harm you; jostle him, and he stings like a nettle.' "

This last remark is illustrated by a story told by Mr. Redgrave in his sketch of Northcote. He hated Sir Thomas Lawrence, probably because the portrait painters of the Reynolds school had gone down before him.

"An artist, then young," says Mr. Redgrave, "who afterwards became a member of the Royal Academy, relates that one day calling upon Northcote, he found him mounted on a pile of boxes, working away with the zeal of a boy at one of his equestrian portraits of George the Fourth, and that his first inquiry of the visitor was whether he had been at the exhibition, and what he thought of the year's collection. To this interrogatory the young artist replied that he thought Lawrence had in the exhibition one of the most perfect pictures in the world. 'A *perfect* picture, do 'ee say, and from the hands of Lăarence! A perfect picture! Why, you talk like a fule! A perfect picture! Why, I've been to Rome, and seen Raffaello, and I never saw a perfect picture by him; and to talk of Lăarence doing a *perfect* picture, good Lord! what nonsense! Lăarence doing anything perfect—why, there never was any perfect picture; at least I never *saw* one.' "

Occasionally, his sharp retorts were turned to legitimate uses. Once when a pedantic coxcomb was crying up Raffaele to the skies, he could not help saying, "If there was nothing in Raffaele but what *you* can see in him, we should not now have been talking of him." Sometimes Northcote professed to be troubled, or really was troubled, by the sharpness of his tongue. Hazlitt says he blamed himself often for uttering what he thought harsh things; and on mentioning this to his friend Kemble, and saying that it sometimes kept him from sleep after he had been out in company, Kemble replied, "Oh, you need not trouble yourself much about them, others never think of them afterwards!" Northcote returned to this point seriously in one of his talks with Hazlitt, and spoke of it with much shrewdness and knowledge of human nature.

"It will never do," he said, "to take things literally that are uttered in a moment of irritation. You do not express your own opinion, but one has opposite as possible to that of the person who has provoked you. You get as

far from a person you have taken a pique against as you can, just as you turn off the pavement to get out of the way of a chimney-sweeper; but it is not to be supposed that you prefer walking in the mud, for all that. I have often been ashamed myself of speeches I have made in that way, which have been repeated to me as good things, when all I meant was that I would say anything rather than agree to the nonsense and affectation I heard. You then set yourself against what you think a wrong bias in another, and are not like a wall but a buttress—as far from the right line as your antagonist, and the more absurd he is, the more so do you become.”

Though he had no great literary capacity, and literally no school training, Northcote was desirous of making a reputation as an author. His reading was extensive, but his faculty of composition was limited. He knew no language but English, and this imperfectly. Throughout life he spoke with a broad Devonshire accent, and spelled many words, amongst them the commonest, much as he pronounced them. For Greek literature, even in translation, he had no relish.

“There are some things,” he said to Hazlitt, “with respect to which I am in the same state that a blind man is as to colours. Homer is one of these. I am utterly in the dark about it. I can make nothing of his heroes or his gods. Jack the Giant-killer is the first book I ever read, and I cannot describe the pleasure it gives me, even now.” This was when he was eighty. “I cannot look into it without my eyes filling with tears. I do not know what it is (whether good or bad), but it is to me, from early impressions, the most heroic of performances. I remember once not having money to buy it, and I transcribed it all out with my own hand. This is what I was going to say about Homer. I cannot help thinking that one cause of the high admiration in which it is held, is its being the first book that is put into the hands of young people at school; it is the first spell which opens to them the enchantments of the unreal world. Had I been bred a scholar, I dare say Homer would have been my Jack the Giant-killer.”

The narrow culture thus indicated scarcely fitted the painter for the business of authorship; but, with his customary perseverance, he contrived to write a good deal, and to do it fairly well. He began by contributing essays on Art, critiques, and poems, to Mr. Prince Hoare’s *Journal*, the *Artist*, in 1807. “Mr. Prince Hoare (he says) taxed me the hardest in what I wrote for the *Artist*. He pointed out where I was wrong, and sent it back for me to correct.” His *Life of Reynolds*—still, to a great extent, the best memoir of Sir Joshua—was published in 1813, when Northcote was sixty-seven. Many years afterwards he published a series of his *Fables*, in prose and verse, illustrated by spirited engravings of animals; and a second series was issued after his death. At eighty, he published his *Life of Titian*—none but an artist, he said, could write the life of an artist. It is, however, a feeble and tedious performance, although Hazlitt assisted in the composition, as he did also in that of the *Fables*. This has been denied; but we have Hazlitt’s own testimony to the fact.

A close intimacy had been struck up between Hazlitt and Northcote, and had lasted for several years. Hazlitt conceived the idea

of writing down and publishing their conversations. Northcote assented. "You may, if you think it worth while; but I do assure you that you overrate them. You have not lived long enough in society to be a judge. What is new to you, you think will seem so to others." The Conversations were printed, under the title of "*Boswell Redivivus*," in the *New Monthly Magazine*, then under Campbell's editorship. Their personalities, their freshness, and the racy character of Northcote's sayings, attracted much notice, and provoked sharp controversy. This led to a quarrel between Northcote and Hazlitt. The Mudge family, who had befriended Northcote in youth, were somewhat coarsely assailed in the conversations. Mr. Rosdew, of Plymouth, the nephew of Mr. Zachary Mudge, expostulated with Northcote. The painter "broke out into the most violent expressions of rage and passion. He called Hazlitt a Papist, a wretch, a viper, whom he would stab if he could get at him." Then he wrote to Campbell—

"I find there are frequently papers in your publication, entitled, very modestly, '*Boswell Redivivus*,' insinuating that the hero of this trivial stuff is to be compared to the immortal Dr. Johnson. This person seems pretty clearly to be made out to be myself. Good God! do you not feel this to be dreadful? But this is not the worst of the matter. I have often, in my vain moments, said that I should be pleased to receive morning visits from the Devil, because I might be amused by his knowledge of the world, and diverted by his wit, and should be sufficiently on my guard to avoid his snares. This impious desire has indeed been granted to me, and '*Boswell Redivivus*' is the consequence."

Now that personal controversies are silenced by time, we may estimate The Conversations of Northcote at their true value. As republished in a volume—in the life-time of the painter—they are softened down from the original draught; but spice enough is left to make them most attractive and amusing reading. Northcote was unquestionably proud of them. "Don't," he would say to his visitors with a chuckle, "go and print what I have said;" and, as to the Conversations themselves, he excused himself by saying that "he did not print them," while Hazlitt excused himself by saying that "he did not speak them." This depreciation, however, is mere affectation; both speaker and writer were secretly delighted with their work: and not without cause, for there are few books of the same class which are more original, fuller of shrewd observation, or expressed with greater force and freedom. The reputation of Northcote may, indeed, rest more securely upon this volume than upon his more pretentious efforts in literature, or than even upon his pictures; for, as Hazlitt presents him, he was far brighter and more picturesque than he was upon canvas. To the collected and revised editions of the Conversations, Hazlitt prefixes a motto from Armstrong—

"The precepts here of a divine old man  
I could recite."

With a liberal interpretation, this is not too much to say. The charm of the book consists in its frankness and its discursive character. Stimulated by his acute interrogator, Northcote discourses with unreserve on whatever topic may happen to come uppermost—the old masters; Sir Joshua; the brilliant group which met at Reynolds's house; contemporary men, women, and manners; politics, literature, religion, morals—all take their turn, and are all discussed with vigorous freedom, and illustrated with witty observations, or appropriate anecdote. All the while the talker himself is present to the life—his tastes, fancies, prejudices, preferences.

Cynicism was Northcote's habit of mind. He knew it, and tried to excuse the propensity. "I am sometimes thought cold and cynical myself; but I hope it is not for any overweening opinion of myself. I remember once going with Wilkie to Angerstein's, and because I stood looking and said nothing, he seemed dissatisfied, and said, 'I suppose you are too much occupied with admiring, to give me your opinion?' I answered hastily, 'No, indeed! I was saying to myself, "And this is all that the Art can do."'" But this was not, I am sure, an expression of triumph, but of mortification, at the defects which I could not help observing even in the most accomplished works." The Ireland forgeries were mentioned. "Caleb Whitefoord," said Northcote, "who ought to have known better, asked me if I did not think Sheridan a judge, and that he believed in the authenticity of the Ireland papers. I said, 'Do you bring him as a fair witness? He wants to fill his theatre, and would write a play himself and swear it was Shakespeare's. He knows better than to cry stale fish.'" Some printsellers failed. Northcote "did not wonder at it; it was a just punishment of their presumption and ignorance." Hazlitt told him that he had seen "the hair of Lucrezia Borgia, of Milton, Bonaparte, and Dr. Johnson, all folded up in the same paper. It had belonged to Lord Byron." Northcote replied, "One could not be sure of that; it was easy to get a lock of hair, and call it by any name one pleased." Of authors and painters he said, "the most wretched scribbler looks down upon the greatest painter as a mere mechanic; but who would compare Lord Byron with Titian?" Speaking of Byron, and the dispute about burying him in Poets' Corner, he said, "Byron would have resisted it violently if he could have known of it. If they had laid him there, he would have got up again. No, I'll tell you where they should have laid him: if they had buried him with the kings in Henry VII.'s chapel, he would have had no objection to that." Of royalty he had something to say.

"You violent politicians," he said to Hazlitt, "make more rout about royalty than it is worth: it is only the highest place, and somebody must fill it, no matter who; neither do the persons themselves think so much of it as you

imagine: they are glad to get into privacy as much as they can. Nor is it a sinecure. The late king, I have been told, used often to have to sign his name to papers, and do nothing else for three hours together, till his fingers fairly ached, and then he would take a walk in the garden, and come back to repeat the same drudgery for three hours more. So, when they told Louis XV. that if he went on with his extravagance, he would bring about a revolution and be sent over to England with a pension, he merely asked, 'Do you think the pension would be a pretty good one?'

On religion he was cynical also.

"I said to Godwin, when he had been trying to unsettle the opinions of a young artist whom I knew, 'Why should you wish to turn him out of one house, till you have provided another for him?' Besides, what do you know of the matter more than he does? His nonsense is as good as your nonsense, when both are equally in the dark.' As to the follies of the Catholics, I do not think the Protestants can pretend to be quite free from them. So when a chaplain of Lord Bath's was teasing a Popish clergyman, to know how he could make up his mind to admit that absurdity of transubstantiation, the other made answer, 'Why, I'll tell you: when I was young, I was taught to swallow Adam's apple; and since that, I have found no difficulty with anything else.'"

The Academy did not please him in his later years: they put his pictures into bad places, and gave preference to other painters of portrait and history. The recommendation-paper for students contained a blank for a statement of the candidate's moral character.

" 'This zeal for morality,' said Northcote, 'begins with inviting me to tell a lie. I know whether he can draw or not, because he brings me specimens of his drawings; but what am I to know of the moral character of a person I have never seen before? Or what business have the Academy to inquire into it? I suppose they are not afraid he will steal the Farnese Hercules. I told one of them, with as grave a face as I could, that as to his moral character he must go to his godfathers and godmothers for that. He answered very simply that they were a great way off, and that he had nobody to appeal to but his apothecary. 'This would not have happened in Sir Joshua's time,' he went on, 'nor even in Fuseli's; but the present men are dressed in a little brief authority, and they wish to make the most of it, without perceiving the limits.'"

On another occasion he said—

"When the Academy first began, one would suppose that the members were so many angels sent from Heaven to fill the different situations, and that was the reason why it began. Now, the difficulty is to find anybody fit for them; and the deficiency is supplied by interest, intrigue, and cabal. Not that I dislike the individuals, neither. As Swift says, I like Jack, Tom, and Harry, very well by themselves; but all together they are not to be endured. We see the effect of people acting in concert in animals (for men are only a more vicious sort of animals). A single dog will let you kick and cuff him as you please, and will submit to any treatment; but if you meet a pack of hounds, they will set upon you and tear you to pieces with the greatest impudence. The Academy very soon degenerated. It is the same in all human institutions. The thing is, there has been found no way yet to keep the devil out."

Space fails to quote his opinions of artists and others whom he had known—Reynolds, Johnson, Burke, Goldsmith, Garrick; and later, Wordsworth, Scott, Fuseli, Lawrence, Canova, Godwin, and others—of all of whom he spoke with the most engaging freedom

and candour. His character has disclosed itself throughout the narrative; it was cynical in a high degree, but it was marked also by the better qualities of self-reliance, perseverance, and sturdy independence. Two anecdotes bring out these qualities in prominent relief. When Master Betty, the Young Roscius, was playing to crowded houses, Northcote painted him. William the Fourth, then Duke of Clarence, took the young prodigy to the painter's house, and stood watching the progress of the picture.

"The loose gown in which Northcote painted was principally composed of shreds and patches, and might, perchance, be half a century old; his white hair was sparingly bestowed on each side, and his cranium was entirely bald. The royal visitor, standing behind him while he painted, first gently lifted, or rather twitched, the collar of the gown, which Northcote resented by suddenly turning, and expressing his displeasure by a frown; on which his Royal Highness, touching the professor's grey locks, said, 'You don't devote much time to the toilette, I perceive.' Northcote instantly replied, 'Sir, I never allow any one to take personal liberties with me; you are the first who ever presumed to do so, and I beg your Royal Highness to remember that I am in my own house.' The artist then resumed his painting; the prince stood silent for a minute or so, then opened the door, and went away. The royal carriage, however, had not arrived, and rain was falling; the prince returned, borrowed an umbrella, and departed. 'Dear Mr. Northcote,' said one of the ladies present, 'I fear you have offended his Royal Highness.' 'Madam,' said the painter, 'I am the offended party.' The next day, about noon, Mr. Northcote was alone, when a gentle tap was heard, the studio door opened, and in walked the prince. 'Mr. Northcote,' he said, 'I am come to return your sister's umbrella; I brought it myself that I might have an opportunity of saying that yesterday I thoughtlessly took an unbecoming liberty with you, which you properly resented. I really am angry with myself, and hope you will forgive me, and think no more about it.' 'And what did you say?' inquired a friend to whom the painter told the story. 'Say! Good God! what could I say? I only bowed; he might see what I felt. I could, at that moment, have sacrificed my life for him—such a prince is worthy to be a king.' The prince afterwards, in his sailor-like way, said of Northcote, 'He's a damned honest, independent, little old fellow.'"

The next and last anecdote—highly characteristic of the man—carries us back to the studio of Reynolds, when Northcote was his pupil. The Prince of Wales met Northcote, and was pleased with him. "What do you know of his Royal Highness?" asked Sir Joshua. "Nothing," answered Northcote. "Nothing, sir! why, he says he knows you very well." "Pooh!" said Northcote, "that is only his *brag*!"

J. THACKRAY BUNCE.

## INDIA AND LANCASHIRE.

THE entire consumption of cotton by the factories of the world, so far as can be ascertained from reliable sources, was, in 1875, 7,154,000 bales, reducing the bales of various weights to a common standard of 400lbs. each. Of this quantity—

Great Britain consumed	.	.	3,187,000 bales, or 44·6 per cent.
Continental Europe consumed	.	2,362,000	„ „ 33·0 „ „
United States consumed	.	1,441,000	„ „ 20·1 „ „
Bombay (excluding the rest of India)			
consumed	.	.	164,000 „ „ 2·3 „ „

It is unsatisfactory to have to notice that the proportion of the whole consumption which has fallen to our share, has been gradually declining since 1861, when it was 49·4 per cent., and that although the consumption of Great Britain is greater now than then by only 370,000 bales, that of the Continent of Europe is greater by 568,000 bales, of the United States by 353,000 bales, and of Bombay by 164,000 bales, showing a total increase in these quarters of 1,085,000 bales, or nearly three times that of Great Britain; whilst appearances indicate that the same relative development of the cotton trades of England and the rest of the world is likely to be apparent in the future.<sup>1</sup>

The average amount of our entire Export trade, during the last six years, was £232,800,000, to which the average annual contribution of cotton goods and yarns was £74,624,000, or one-third of the whole. It is important to my object that I should point out that during the same period our exports of cotton goods and yarns to India averaged £14,759,695, one-fifth of the total export of our cotton productions.

It may, however, make the survey of the subject more complete, if I also show to what countries we distribute this trade in cottons, and if any reader should find the figures tedious or embarrassing he can readily pass them over as not being of essential importance to what follows. For this purpose I shall deal only with the single year 1875, and it will be found that the proportional features of the trade of that year correspond very nearly with those of the six years. Our exports of all articles amounted to £223,500,000, of cotton goods and yarns to £71,735,000, which was made up as follows:—

(1) Ellison and Co.'s Review of the Cotton Trade for 1875.



## EXPORTS OF COTTON GOODS AND YARNS TO THE FOLLOWING COUNTRIES IN 1875.

India and Ceylon . . . . .	£17,326,566	
Continent of Europe . . . . .	14,306,828	
China, Hong Kong, and Japan . . . . .	8,943,834	
Mexico, South America, and West Indies . . . . .	7,856,016	
Turkey and Egypt . . . . .	6,133,311	
British Colonies . . . . .	3,943,217	
United States . . . . .	1,900,032	
Other countries . . . . .	6,043,291	
		£66,453,095
Miscellaneous items consisting of lace, hosiery, thread, and other manufactures to all countries . . . . .		5,281,974
		£71,735,069

The half million people and £120,000,000 of capital directly employed in the cotton trade, and all the multitudinous industries dependent upon it, not the least important of which in a national sense is the shipping trade, depend for their prosperity, in a larger degree than is perhaps generally understood, upon the *foreign* demand for the produce of our spindles and looms. The cotton goods and yarns produced in the United Kingdom in the last ten years have averaged 965,019,800 lbs., and the quantity retained for home consumption 154,400,000 lbs., or only 16 per cent. of the whole.

Large as our cotton industry is, it is a trade of comparatively recent growth, and it is well known that not three generations ago India not only supplied herself with cotton manufactures, but exported them to other countries. It is due to the inventions of Watt, Arkwright, Hargreaves, Crompton, and Cartwright, during the latter third of the last century; to our possession and use of coal and iron; to the obstruction to all organized industrial progress on the Continent of Europe, due to the continued state of war which prevailed there whilst we were giving solid foundations to our manufacturing industry, that we have been indebted, to a great extent, for the vast progress of our various manufactures, and more particularly for that of cotton. It is also due to these circumstances that we have, for so long a period, exported cotton goods to Continental nations as well adapted by nature as ourselves for the trade, and that we have even supplanted the native Hindoo manufacturer in clothing the millions of India to the extent of one-half of their requirements in cotton goods. This advantage could not in the nature of things be permanent. Coal and iron have been found and brought into use on the Continent of Europe and in America; the commerce and manufactures of these countries have grown and are still growing rapidly; and India, no longer relying upon the spindle and distaff, nor upon the hand loom, has adopted our system of factory organization as her means of competition with us, firstly, for the command of her own markets, and doubtless, eventually, for the supply of others, especially those of the far East.

The first Indian cotton-mill was built in 1863, and the *Bombay Government Gazette* of the 4th November, 1875, gives the names of thirty-nine mills actually at work at that date in the Bombay Presidency and other districts, but excluding some in other parts of India; whilst the *Times of India* of March 27th, 1876, gives the number at work in the Bombay Presidency as having increased from the beginning to the end of 1875 from twenty-two to forty. The numbers given in the *Bombay Government Gazette* are, for 1870-1, eleven; 1871-2, fourteen; 1872-3, fifteen; 1873-4, twenty-five; and 1874-5—that is, up to August—thirty-nine. These figures displaying the rapid growth of this industry, I will only produce one other fact to illustrate it. According to the *Times of India* of 17th July, 1874, there were 22,085,000 rupees invested at that time in cotton-mills in Bombay and the neighbourhood, and the *Bombay Government Gazette* of the 4th November, 1875, gives the particulars of factories at work with a capital of over 38,000,000 rupees, thus showing the astounding increase of considerably over fifty per cent. in a single year. It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of spindles at work, but it is within the mark to state it at 1,000,000, and the increase of the year at more than 400,000 spindles. If this rate of increase continues in India—that is, if she adds to her spinning power 400,000 spindles a year—she will have increased her total number of spindles by the entire quantity engaged in England in producing for the Indian markets, which is between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000, in sixteen years. But if she were to go on building factories at the rate of fifty per cent. upon her actual investment at the end of each year, she would accomplish the same end in five years.

There is still, and is likely to be, every inducement to embark capital continuously in these undertakings, and, as I will endeavour to show farther on, the retention or removal of the duty will have a powerful influence in fixing the rate, and, in a lesser degree, the extent of its investment. No doubt there will arise from time to time combinations of causes which will temporarily check the progress of this Indian industry, for no great trade can spring up all at once, competing with rivals who have prior possession of markets, and requiring the conquest of first one field of demand and then another, without meeting with occasional difficulty and passing disaster. But on the whole the future of the cotton-mills of India seems extremely hopeful.

It may reasonably be said that these are simply interesting facts; that the return of a trade to its old channels is not unnatural; that it is an occasion of pride to England that she has so far acquitted herself of a contracted obligation to her great dependency as to secure for her the peace which fosters trade, attracts capital, and promotes material development; and that,

although this feeling may be subject to modification, and cannot be unaccompanied with regret that injury is necessarily inflicted upon an important British trade, yet that the British manufacturer has no ground of complaint because the superior natural resources of India are now restoring to that country a trade which temporary causes for a while gave to England. If this were the actual state of the case, I should have nothing to say against it; neither, so far as it is so, have I the least complaint to make.

The demand of Lancashire is limited to asking that the manufacturers of England and of India shall be allowed to compete freely with each other, neither being aided by protective duties. On the side of India there is cheap and abundant labour, cotton indigenous to the soil and close to the factory, with the markets close at hand; and on that of England cheaper machinery and coal, more abundant capital, and a higher intelligence. If the Hindoo, as the result of those gifts with which nature aids him, can take from us the supply of the markets of India, and should he subsequently, from the same causes, deprive us of our large trade with the East, we must bear the consequences, however seriously not only our own, but national interests may suffer.

We do not ask that any impediment should be put in the way of the full development of the Indian cotton industry, nor that it should be exposed to fiscal obstruction of any kind. We object to her import of such cotton as may be found suited to her manufactures being kept from her by import duties, and are quite content that her manufactures should be free of export duty on leaving India, and should enter England untaxed. We offer no opposition to her receiving the machinery and coal required for the establishment and maintenance of her rival cotton manufacture, exempt by exceptional favour from those taxes which are imposed upon almost every other article of import. But, on the other hand, we think it not unreasonable that we likewise should be placed upon a similar footing of freedom from fiscal obstruction, and that our trade with India should not be discouraged and artificially abstracted from us by the continuance of import duties which have become protective, and are aiding the development of a huge national steam-power cotton manufacture in India. So reasonable does this position seem that I should have thought it would have received general support from those engaged in active journalism and politics. It is therefore the more surprising to find that we have to encounter the opposition of Whig and once free-trade lords, and some of the most important London daily papers and periodicals. A formidable group of Anglo-Indians are also arrayed against us, and they have succeeded in impressing upon the minds of some of our most eminent and able political chiefs their despondent views of the Indian revenue, which they regard as so inelastic, so unpro-

gressive, so utterly unmanageable, as to render it impossible for the Indian treasury to spare the duty.

The contest, however, although on a new stage, is of a very old character, and one with which we have been long familiar. The arguments advanced, the agencies employed, the activity displayed, are neither more nor less than, nor in anywise different from, those hitherto in common use, when a protected interest has been struggling to maintain its advantages. The Indian millowners, aided by those who have become directly and indirectly interested in their success, and by the bulk of the Anglo-Indian press which they influence, are simply fighting the battle of protection to "native industry." So completely is this the case that the *Calcutta Statesman*, in a recent leading article, after complaining of the injudicious mode in which the campaign had so far been conducted, suggested with ludicrous naïveté that the protectionist "aspect" of the case should be henceforth left out of sight, and that the revenue difficulty should be alone put forward. It will be my endeavour, therefore, to meet the protectionist arguments advanced from all these quarters.

1st. It is said that the duty is not protective. Had it not been for the arguments advanced in the speeches of Lord Halifax and the Duke of Argyll, and in those made in the Legislative Council of India, I should not have deemed it necessary to say one word in favour of so self-evident a proposition as that an import duty imposed upon an article which is produced at home is protective.

The introduction in August 1875 of the New Tariff Bill, retaining the import duty on cotton goods, reducing other import duties, and repealing the export duty on Indian cotton manufactures and on other articles, and its defence in the Legislative Council, were intrusted to Mr. Hope. With reference to the import duty on cotton goods he made the following statement :—

"The Tariff committee found that the duty levied in all India on the coarse goods was only about four lakhs of rupees, or five per cent. of the entire duty on cotton goods, which amounted to about eighty lakhs, and that only half of this sum, or one-fortieth of the whole, belonged to Bombay, where alone there was as yet any considerable local manufacture. The case, therefore, stood thus, that because one-twentieth of the cotton goods imported were subject to a local competition, which only seriously affected one-half of that twentieth, the Government were asked for the 'total and immediate repeal' of the nineteen-twentieths of the duty paid by the remaining cotton goods on which local competition had no effect whatever.

"In Bombay, no doubt the mills took, to a certain extent, the place of increased imports, but the competition of Bombay mills, like their profits, had been greatly exaggerated. After deducting what they made for exportation, and allowing for the extent to which they had displaced the hand-loom weaving of the country, the residuum was not sufficient materially to affect the argument as stated above. The committee were therefore of opinion that the case for total abolition, on the grounds on which it was claimed, must inevitably fall to the ground."

If we estimate the value of Mr. Hope's argument, we shall find

that the reason why only one-twentieth of our exports to India consists of coarse goods, is that the Indian mills have displaced the remainder of our coarse trade. If his conclusion is accepted, his position will be stronger each year, for he will soon be able to say, "The Indian mills make only coarse goods. You send *no* coarse goods to India, and consequently you cannot say that Indian manufactures compete with yours at all." And as the Indian mills produced about 40,000,000 lbs. in 1874, and our whole sendings of coarse goods to India in that year did not exceed 15,000,000 lbs., whilst since then they have nearly doubled their producing power, and are still increasing it, it is clear that in a few years more Mr. Hope might be able to say, "The Indian mills only make coarse goods, and the shirting or medium class; you send to India none of the former, and your exports of the latter are only one-twentieth of your whole export of cotton goods to India. You therefore suffer practically nothing from the rivalry of the Indian mills, and consequently have made out no case for the repeal of the import duty."

The Indian mills will soon have to make other than the coarse class of goods to find occupation for the capital actually and about to be invested. The Indian millowners are quite alive to this necessity, and they are now engaged in making, to a small extent, the finer yarns necessary to the manufacture of shirtings. Samples of these yarns, and of the goods made from them, have been shown in England, and there can be no doubt that they are well adapted to the requirements of the Indian population.

Mr. Hope's assumption that the manufactures produced by the Indian mills had not displaced those of England, but had been partly exported and partly substituted for the native hand manufacture, is disproved by facts easily ascertained. In 1868 the export of Indian cotton manufactures was £1,434,000, the average export in the next three years ending with 1871 was £1,371,000, and for the three years terminating with 1874, £1,401,000; and, as three-fourths of these amounts were re-exports of British goods, it is clear that the increased produce of the Indian mills has not found its outlet in this direction. It is difficult to deal with the allegation that it has displaced the *native hand manufactures* in a direct manner, because it is impossible to ascertain satisfactorily the variations in their extent, but sufficiently accurate conclusions may be arrived at inferentially. The trade of India has extended immensely of late years, having averaged £35,868,465 during the five years terminating with 1854, and £98,346,116 in the quinquennial period ending with 1874, our cotton trade with India having partaken of the general development of Indian commerce, and yet there has been a great falling off in the Indian imports of the class of goods made in the native mills. It can be shown that, whilst concurrently with the extension

of the factory system in Bombay there had been up to the end of 1874 a reduction in the import of the class of goods made in that Presidency by 60 per cent., there had been an increase, corresponding with the general expansion of Indian trade, in our export thither of the class of goods not made in India, of 270 per cent. Moreover, since the end of 1874, there has been a still further diminution in our exports of coarse goods to Bombay.<sup>1</sup>

Hence I may fairly maintain that facts have demonstrated that the production of the Indian mills has taken the place of British; not of native hand manufactures.

I shall now endeavour to show that, although no doubt the duty has materially aided the infant Indian factory industry in its establishment, such are the elements of advantage on the side of the Indian manufacturer, that he can retain the coarse trade without the aid of the duty, and that therefore the proposal which finds favour in some quarters of removing the duty on coarse goods only is indefensible. I shall illustrate my meaning by showing to what extent the advantages on the side of India preponderate over those favouring England, in a mill of 60,000 spindles and 1,000 looms. Such a mill would cost in England about £100,000, and it may be assumed, for the sake of argument, that its cost in India would be £200,000, although it would not be nearly so much. If engaged in the coarse trade, such a mill would consume in the year cotton to the value of about £100,000, and produce goods to that of £200,000. The Indian mill would consume 6,000 tons of coal at 35s. per ton, and the English 5,000 tons at 8s. per ton.

The Indian mill would therefore be weighted with heavier charges for interest and depreciation upon the extra capital of £100,000, and the extra cost of fuel, whilst the English one would be exposed to transit charges upon the conveyance of cotton from India to England, and of the goods from England to India, to the extent of at least 15 per cent. Against the Indian mill, therefore, there would be interest and depreciation, together 12½ per cent. on £100,000, £12,500, and extra cost of coal, £8,500, making £21,000, whilst against the English mill there would be transit charges on £300,000 at 15 per cent., £45,000, and thus the English mill would be at a disadvantage of £24,000, without taking into consideration either the duty, which would amount to £10,000, or the low rate of wages prevailing in India.

As regards the coarse trade, therefore, it would be little better than a farce to remove the duty exceptionally. This trade is virtually gone from England. But the case is different with

(1) I may here explain that as at the earlier period long-cloths, which are coarse goods, were entered in the official returns as shirtings, and as in the later, long-cloths are separately entered, the relative growth in the class of goods not hitherto made in the Indian factories has been greater than the above figures have shown.

reference to the next great branch of our Indian export trade in cotton goods. The "medium," or shirting class of goods, constitutes two-thirds of this trade, and amounts to about £10,000,000 annually.

What then would be the relative position of our Indian and English mill when engaged in this branch? The Indian mill's disadvantages would, as before, amount to £21,000. But, on the other hand, as the cotton consumed would not exceed in value £50,000 nor the goods produced £120,000, the cost in transit charges to the English mill would be reduced to £25,000, diminishing her disadvantage from £24,000, which it would be when making coarse goods, to £4,000. This is no doubt sufficiently serious, but when it is supplemented by the 5 per cent. duty on the turnover of £120,000, or an additional £6,000, there can be no doubt that the two combined are formidable enough eventually to hand over this trade to India.

It is true that, following Mr. Hope's lead, the Bombay Mill-owners' Association has argued that India cannot compete with England for the supply of the Indian markets with any but the coarse goods, for I find in the *Times of India*, an address from that Association to Lord Lytton in which the following passage occurs:—

"Of all this import trade, about £900,000 consisted of coarse descriptions corresponding to the goods turned out by the Indian mills; the remaining £18,500,000 consisted almost entirely of finer qualities which are sent to India by Manchester, and which the Indian manufacturers are unable to produce. It will readily occur to your lordship that the finer qualities of goods, which are consumed by the wealthier classes, are by no means the article of 'first necessity' which the Manchester manufacturers would wish you to believe."

The statement that the Indian manufacturers cannot produce the finer qualities of goods is capable of easy refutation. I have already observed that I have seen yarns and goods of the medium class, made out of Indian cotton in India, of excellent quality. The experience of Lancashire during the time of the American war has proved that at least two-thirds of the goods consumed by the people of India can be made out of Indian cotton, millions of pieces having been so manufactured at that period. It is also a fact, that in India, shirtings, as also a large number of Dhooties requiring finer yarns, are now to a small extent being manufactured. The Tariff Revision Committee of India reported that the Indian mills could make mule twist up to 32's and water twist up to 20's, as also long-cloths, T-cloths, drills, domestics, jeans, and sheetings; but 32's twist is the warp required for the whole of the medium classes of goods, our exports of which to India amount to £10,000,000 sterling annually. We have therefore the authority of the Revision Committee for the statement that the greatest difficulty in the way of this branch of manufacture has already been overcome by the millowners of India, it being a well-known fact that the weft can more readily be

spun from Indian cotton than the warp. Nothing can be more incorrect than the statement of the Bombay Millowners' Association, that the goods composing the £18,500,000 sterling, alluded to in the above extract, are consumed by the wealthier classes; for it is within the knowledge of every English merchant trading with India, that but a very small portion of these goods is consumed by the wealthier classes, the greater consumption being by the masses.

I desire to ask why, if the Indian manufacturers "are unable to produce" the finer goods, they are so intent upon retaining the duty? Are their efforts devoted solely to a disinterested desire to protect the revenues of India; or are they not labouring under an impression that they are defending an impost which is in some way or other advantageous to themselves? They have chosen to speak of the efforts made in England to secure the repeal of this duty as "selfish and unreasonable." I would wish to ask whether the position taken by the English manufacturer, which is that India and England should be permitted to compete with each other, free of every impost and every possible obstruction to their *natural* progress; or that taken by the Indian manufacturer, that *he* should be aided to keep the English manufacturer out of the Indian markets by the assistance of protective duties—is the most "selfish and unreasonable?"

Indian journals have mostly argued the subject from the same point of view; but the *Times of India*, one of the hottest advocates of the continuance of the duty, has adopted an entirely different line of argument in its leading article of March 27th. It says—

"It is very obvious that a duty of 5 per cent. on goods and 3½ per cent. on yarns can but very little affect the case. The real protection to the Indian mills lies elsewhere. Let us examine the matter. The charges and disbursements on the cost of transmission of cotton from India to England, on an average, amount to 1¼d. per lb. Those on 30's twist from England to India, 2¼d. per lb., or 3½d. per lb. The saving to Indian mills established in the cotton districts is still greater. A skilled manufacturer, who has recently visited Bombay for the express purpose of investigating the working of Indian mills, states that a modern mill, running the latest and most improved machinery, honestly and skilfully managed, ought to pay from 40 to 50 per cent. per annum profit, and at all times a minimum profit of 30 per cent. per annum may be fairly expected on mills in India, *arising simply from the avoidance of charges incidental to the transit of cotton from India to England*, amounting to 20 per cent. on the price of the raw cotton in Bombay, and return charges to India on yarns and goods, which charges amount to 20 per cent."

Farther on in the article it is stated that "the number of spinning and weaving factories in the Presidency increased during 1875, from twenty-two to forty, and there are now 886,098 spindles and 8,537 looms," and then, "the Indian cotton-growing and manufacturing industry must be developed surely and rapidly. The abolition of the cotton duties could not retard that development; if there be any magic in free trade doctrines it might even accelerate it."



And thus we see Mr. Hope maintaining that the duty has only an inappreciable protective operation, because England has a monopoly of the supply of the Indian markets in all but coarse goods; the *Times of India*, supporting the position that it has no protective operation, because the advantages of India are so great that the duty adds but infinitesimally to their incidence; and others insisting that it ought to be retained, because the Indian manufacturer requires its aid. The true position, however, is that England having virtually lost the coarse trade, and being about to be involved in a heavy struggle for the balance, it depends upon the course pursued by the Indian authorities whether the contest becomes a fair one, or whether, by mere weight of fiscal pressure, the English millowner and workmen are sacrificed to their Indian rivals.

So strongly is this my conviction, that if the duty is to be removed from a *class of goods*, I am quite content that the Indian manufacturers engaged in the coarse trade should continue to enjoy the benefit of the duty, which under the circumstances will be entirely without effect; whilst I should ask on behalf of English manufacturers, that the duty upon the medium and finer trades, for which the competition will be real and active, should be repealed. I am by no means certain that, even if the duty be at once removed, England will not have to retire before the natural advantages and resources possessed by India for the supply of her own markets; but it is infinitely important that such a change, if brought about, should be so gradual as to allow of our drifting into our altered circumstances by slow degrees. Neither can it be considered a matter of indifference, that our hard-headed and industrious northern artisans should be able justly to impute to their Government misfortune and deprivation of employment as the result of the maintenance of a duty, which they may attribute to a disposition to foster the trade of India, and transfer occupation from the well-paid British workman to the low-waged Hindoo. That their minds are well prepared for this complaint is clear from remarks that are not uncommon among them, such as the following: "I cannot see why you capitalists should feel so strongly on this question. You can invest your capital in Indian mills, and employ the Hindoo at from 3*d.* to 6*d.* a day; but, on the other hand, the question is a vital one to us, for we cannot go to India and work at such wages."

That the duty is regarded and valued by Indian officials as protective is certain. *The Moral and Material Progress of India* for 1872-3, page 109, has the following. "A great quantity of cotton is worked up in India, and the duty on imported piece goods fosters and encourages the home manufacture." The 1875 Tariff Revision Committee recommended the imposition of an import duty

of 2½ per cent. on machinery, on the ground that there appeared "no reason for continuing to it the indulgence originally given as an encouragement and help to the nascent manufacturing industry of India;" but the Government rejected the proposal because it was "of opinion that it was as important to encourage manufacturing industry now, as at the time these articles received the favour they enjoy." Sir William Muir said, "one chief merit of the present measures is, that unfettered export will promote domestic manufacture, not only in this case but in that of cotton goods, and we may assuredly hope that India has a new rôle before her by the growth of a flourishing export trade in her own manufactures."

2nd. As regards the assertion "that the duty is insignificant in its incidence on account of the smallness of its amount," I have frequently been asked whether so small a duty as 5 per cent. can have any influence whatever upon the competition for the supply of the Indian markets, and I can well understand that to many it must appear a very unimportant thing. It depends, however, very much upon the nature of a trade whether a 5 per cent. duty is oppressive or not. In small trades where the amount turned over is trifling and the *rate of profit* extremely large, where the income is produced by large profits on a small turnover, the effect of a 5 per cent. duty might not be so serious; but in highly organized trades employing a large capital, where the profits are made by a small per centage upon a large turnover, the case is widely different, and the effect of such a duty may be fatal to a trade.

Take, for example, the Indian and English mills I have before used for the purposes of illustration in the course of this article. Let us presume that the cost of production, and all charges necessary to lay the English goods down in the Bombay market, and the cost of production in the Bombay mill were the same—and this presumption is necessary if we desire to estimate the pressure of the duty *per se*—then we have the Indian mill-owner with a preferential sum secured to him by the effect of the duty of £6,000 a year. Let us then suppose that each mill is worked for thirty years, which we may call the average business life of a man. What then becomes of their relative position? Why the Indian mill has been aided by the duty to the extent of £180,000, besides accumulated interest. Suppose then the English mill to have made nothing, or to have lost £100,000, the Indian millowner is still, through the instrumentality of the duty, a wealthy man.

The above comparison rests upon the assumption that the two mills contain the same number of spindles and looms. It is open to the objection that the Indian mill would involve the investment of more capital than the English, and that the calculation should be made for mills costing the same money, rather than containing the

same quantity of machinery. I have assumed in a previous part of this article, in order rather to under than overstate an argument on my own side, that a mill costs twice as much in India as in England; and if that were so, the Indian millowner would only have half the number of spindles and looms possessed by his English rival, and the duty would only, capital for capital, give him an advantage of £90,000, with interest and compound interest, in his thirty years' competition. I am, however, satisfied that the cost of a mill and machinery in India ought not to exceed by more than fifty per cent. that of one in England, if the arrangements are properly managed throughout, and thus the duty would operate in favour of the Indian competitor to the extent of £120,000, and interest, or two-thirds, instead of one-half, the amount stated in the original comparison.

I have been told also, that such is the enterprise, intelligence, and skill of the Lancashire manufacturer, that should he lose the Indian branch of the cotton trade, which supplies one-fifth of the total export of cotton goods, he would soon develop other outlets for his products.

The facts of the case are against this argument. The Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom shows that our exports of cottons to all parts of the world, excluding India, were, in 1870, £58,111,793, and that they had dwindled down in 1875 to £55,668,933. It is true that this reduction in value was in a great measure due to a fall in the price of the raw material, but there was also a falling off in quantities, whilst it is usual for the quantities to increase as the price diminishes.

It must not be forgotten, as bearing upon this point, that our best machine makers are everywhere engaged in supplying mills on the continent, in America, and India, with machinery, and that every market has now to be contended for more keenly than ever; that therefore this is not the time when, as Lord Salisbury has said, her Majesty's Government can allow a policy "which Parliament, after mature deliberation, has sanctioned, to be set aside without special cause in any part of the empire under their direct control."

Lord Northbrook, followed by the Bombay Millowners' Association, has argued that because our exports of cottons to India were greater in 1875 than in the previous year, we had nothing to apprehend from the rivalry of Indian mills, and that, combined with the growth of the Indian manufactures, we might also expect an increase in our export trade to India. The fact of an increased export of cotton goods to India in 1875, certainly proves that the consumption of cotton goods in India has enlarged, but this circumstance has no bearing whatever upon the question at issue, which is, whether India or England, weighted by the duty, is best able to supply the markets of India with cotton goods; and the presumption is that India, whose mills have made very large profits in the last two or

three years, will be better able to meet her requirements than the English millowners, whose export trade to India, as is well known, has been conducted at a loss during the same period. I have a balance-sheet of an Indian mill which shows a profit for the year ending the 30th June, 1874, of £27,000, and for the year ending June, 1875, of £24,000—that Indian mill not being *one-third* the size of my own.

3rd. That “the question should be regarded from an exclusively Indian and not in any sense from an Imperial, point of view,” seems an untenable position when the great imperial interests involved and our political relations with India are considered. Holland derives a revenue from Java, Spain from Cuba, when Cuba is at peace. Indeed, with most nations colonies have been principally valued as sources of wealth. As a paramount power we are probably the first nation to set the example of considering that it is among the obligations due to a great dependency, that attention should be given to the development of her resources, the promotion of her moral and material progress, the elevation of her people, with singleness of purpose, and without the subordination of her trading and commercial interests to the promotion of the corresponding elements in the prosperity of the ruling state. It is for the credit of England that she so regards her duty to India. But it would be carrying disinterestedness to a most extravagant length if, when Indian questions arose intermixed with features bearing upon English interests, and capable of solution so as to promote the latter without injury to the former, it should be deemed a point of honour to ignore the imperial point of view, and to act for India not only as if she were an entirely independent power, but as if no such nation as England were in existence.

These duties are levied on an article of general consumption in India, and are, as we have been told by Lord Halifax, paid by the great mass of the people. Their effect is not only to raise the price of all imported goods, but also of those produced by the factories of India, with, however, this difference, that the increase of price *on the imported goods* goes into the Indian treasury, and that *on the home manufactured product* into the pockets of the Indian mill-owner. The consumer, therefore, has not only, through the agency of this duty, to contribute to the Indian revenue, but also to add to the profits, and thus stimulate the growth, of Indian cotton factories. This cannot be an advantage to India if free trade doctrines are not delusions.

Ought we to forget that in estimating the sources of our strength for the maintenance of our Indian empire, the sentiment of the mass of the British people is not to be disregarded? They may be asked to shed their blood and lavish the wealth of the

kingdom in defence of this magnificent possession. Is it then politic to weaken the material links which bind England and India? Our exports to India have averaged £21,331,420 during the last six years, and to this amount the average contribution of cotton goods and yarns has been £14,759,695, or over two-thirds. If this branch of our Indian trade should be lost, the whole value of English products consumed in India would be reduced to a comparatively insignificant amount. Might not those who make parliaments and dictate the composition of governments ask the question, Is India worth the sacrifice? Is it not all the more likely that such a question should rise to the lips of artisans, should British industries be transferred, by the instrumentality of protective duties, from England to India? Is it impossible that the motives for the persistent maintenance of a false system, by which the cheap labour of the Hindoo supplanted the dearer labour of the British workman, should be suspected? We all know that when the honour of England is in question, class jealousies are suppressed, and that if the great trial should come, all classes would combine to vindicate our right and superiority; but is it wise—by a wilful disregard of economic principles—universally accepted in England, to give occasion for hesitation and not unreasonable discontent?

It has been stated as a duty of the Secretary of State for India, that he should "study everything from an Indian point of view, and make himself the spokesman and defender of India before his countrymen at home." It seems, however, to be forgotten that the Secretary of State for India is a member of the Imperial cabinet, responsible like every one of its members to parliament and the country for all its measures, not only as they may concern this or that colony or dependency, but as they affect imperial concerns, not forgetting England as a somewhat important factor in the Empire; and that should he be disposed to leave England entirely out of his survey he may be brought "face to face with the fact that the supreme power is" in parliament. It is idle to attempt to transform the Secretary of State into a purely Indian minister. It is the province of the Viceroy and the Legislative Council to think exclusively of India, and of the Secretary of State for India to temper their proposals with just that degree of modification which may guard imperial interests from being subordinated unduly to Indian sectional interests or prejudices, which are not unlikely at times to weigh with too heavy a preponderance upon the thought and judgment of those engrossed with the details of the government of that vast empire, with all its complicated organization and infinite variety of wants, systems, and stages of development.

4th. If "it is true that Indian prejudices as well as Indian true interests should guide our policy as governors of India," then pro-

bably we should hesitate to punish infanticide, that being regarded as consistent with sound economic principles in some important districts of India, whilst even Suttee has the support of wide-spread native prejudice ; and, probably the most cherished Indian prejudice of all is, that it would be for the advantage of India—that, at least, it would increase her dignity and give her the blessings of independence—if we were to retire from the country.

I am inclined to think that it is our duty to India, so long as we rule her through the agency of appointees of the crown, to apply to the Government of India those economic principles which we have proved by experience to be best calculated to promote the well-being of nations ; and if it is answered that the prejudices of the people interpose an impassable barrier in the way of such action, I reply that there are many important evidences to the contrary, and that the ablest Indian statesmen are not so oppressed by the sense of the impossibility of doing in India what is best for her interests.

5th. Although it is admitted by the Government and many of our opponents that this impost ought to go, we are told that “the continuance of the duty is indispensable to the equilibrium of Indian finance.”

It ought first to be agreed what is meant by the equilibrium of Indian finance. Sir George Campbell would pay for the bulk of the “extraordinary public works” out of revenue, and have a normal surplus of from two to five millions sterling to meet possible contingencies. No objection can be raised to such an aspiration. To spend less than your income, to improve your estate, and to lay by an annual surplus is creditable and desirable alike to individuals and states. With the latter it is the most difficult, because public revenues are provided from private purses, and taxpayers are unwilling to pay more than is indispensable to meet current expenditure. Hence it can hardly be expected that the elevated financial system which Sir George Campbell prefers can be introduced into India. The wealthier nations of Europe are compelled to be less ambitious ; and those responsible for the government of India are content with a moderate surplus over ordinary expenditure. I am afraid, therefore, that we must be satisfied if India can pay her way as regards all ordinary expenditure, and if she borrows money when she invests on a large scale.

Lord Northbrook, speaking at the meeting of the Legislative Council of India in August last, said, “It will be seen that our surplus in four years has amounted to £7,000,000, or more than three times the sum which the Home Government desired. This satisfactory result, moreover, has been accompanied by a considerable remission of taxation. In the year 1873 the income tax, which, during the two preceding years had produced a net sum of £1,362,570, was allowed

to lapse. The Southern Customs line, which drew its long and obstructive length of 800 miles across Central India, has been abolished at a considerable sacrifice to the salt revenue; and yet in each of the last two years we have realised a very substantial surplus. The sound condition of our finances, in my opinion, mainly results, on the one hand, from the gradual increase of the revenue in consequence of the increased wealth and prosperity of the country, and on the other, from the exercise of strict economy in every department of the State."

Sir William Muir, the Finance Minister of India, said, "Then the other main sources of our revenue—land, excise, salt, customs—are all in a sound state, and show a tendency to rise, and that in a far more marked and rapid way than any increase in the charges of administration." And when introducing the budget for 1876-7 he also used these words: "As most of the improvement is the outcome of a progressive advance in the leading branches of the revenue, it may be safely concluded that the sources of imperial income are in a sound condition, and, indeed, that they never gave better promise of prosperity."

It is true that all this bright aspect of the condition of the Indian revenue, as regards its elastic and progressive character, the satisfactory progress and prosperity of all the various sources of revenue, is to a certain extent clouded by the loss arising from the fall in the value of silver. The gloomy views and predictions expressed about the revenue have, however, been advanced irrespective of this element of difficulty, and would have been urged equally if it had not arisen. I shall examine and criticise some of these views, and I think I shall be able to expose their fallacy.

First, then, as to the progressive character of the revenue. The entire revenue of India, in 1840, was £20,124,038, and in 1875, £50,570,177, showing a most remarkable increase in thirty-five years. It is true that the boundaries of India have been increased by conquests since 1840, and that part of the development of her revenue is due to that cause; but so far as I have been able to ascertain, the entire revenue derived from these conquests has not exceeded £6,000,000 to £7,000,000 sterling per year. The conquered provinces are Scind, the Punjab, Sattara, Behar, British Burmah, Bera, and Oudh. In 1858 the revenue was £31,706,776, since which time there has been no addition to territory. Thus, as a result of the progress of the wealth and commerce of India, the great advance of from £31,706,776 to over £50,000,000 has been contributed by the people of India. Then it is often urged that the ~~entire~~ revenue is not trustworthy. In 1840 it was only £784,266. It has since advanced by gradual stages until in 1875 it had reached £8,556,629, and it surely must have undergone the various trials and checks to which it is possible for it to be exposed during that

lengthened period. The salt revenue was in 1840 £2,696,745, and in 1875 £6,227,301. Attention is here called to the great increase that has taken place in this branch of Indian revenue, because statesmen of Indian celebrity, and Englishmen who have adopted their views, are continually declaiming against the salt revenues of India. Whenever a demand is made that the protective duties on cotton fabrics shall be repealed, they put forward the greater necessity for the repeal of the salt duties. It is perfectly clear, however, that those responsible for the government of India and its finances have no earnest intention of giving up this important source of income. So far from showing a disposition to give up these £6,000,000 sterling a year, they have from time to time increased the pressure of the tax, and are constantly engaged in altering and probably improving the nature of its incidence, thereby indicating that they regard it as a permanent source of revenue, and probably as a legitimate means of reaching the great mass of the Indian population. I am not prepared to deny that I should be glad to see these taxes reduced, although I cannot think that the millions of India should be freed from all share of the cost of the government of their own country. But, on the other hand, I must urge that the duty on salt is not open to the objection that it is protective, and tends to diminish the resources of the people.

Then when we are told that no new sources of Indian revenue can be introduced with advantage, the great development of the stamp duty seems to lead to a contrary conclusion, for the stamp duty realised only £427,687 in 1840; and although this is a kind of tax unknown in the native history of India, the revenue derived from it in 1875 had reached £2,758,042. It can therefore hardly be said that our statesmen are limited to the ancient modes of levying taxes in India.

Sir George Campbell, in an able and interesting article which appeared in this Review in the month of April, entered very fully into his views on Indian finance. He stated that there was a deficiency on the year 1874-5 of £4,526,592. He arrives at this conclusion by a process of reasoning to which I demur, apparently in common with Lord Northbrook, and those most concerned in the actual working of Indian finance. It does not seem consistent with true principles of finance to debit the expenditure on reproductive works to ordinary revenue. Those who advocate this policy are undoubtedly largely influenced by the apprehension that much of this outlay will be expended on works which are not reproductive, and will not pay either directly or indirectly fair interest upon the capital invested. Of course it is indispensable that the financiers of India should prevent outlay of this unsatisfactory description. It is, however, extravagant to propose that India, whose finances are so assailed as to their want of strength and power, should invest such



sums as four millions annually in what may be called new estate, and debit this expenditure to revenue.

In the charges for the year 1875-6, famine relief stood for £656,000, and it may fairly be doubted whether the cost of such a famine as that which has just occurred in Bengal and Behar should be debited to the ordinary revenue of the current years. It was stated by several leading Indians, in the debate on the cost of this famine, that it was of a character and intensity which only exhibits itself once in a century. India seems to be afflicted by famines like this and scarcities, the scarcities being about decennial in their appearance. It therefore would have been fair and statesmanlike to have distributed the cost of the famine relief over a series of years, and not to have made the revenue of India appear so much less satisfactory than it really was by debiting nearly seven millions sterling to the ordinary revenue of three years. As Lord Northbrook has pointed out, when the Irish famine occurred, only two millions were debited to the revenue of the year, and the remainder was borrowed.

I think, therefore, that it will be admitted by most, that the cost of reproductive works, such as railways and irrigation works, are not a fair charge against "ordinary revenue," and many will allow that the famine charge might have been distributed over a number of years. All I think will agree, that if actually paid out of the revenue of the years when it occurred, it should not be treated as a permanent, continuous source of expenditure, when dealing with the question of the adequacy or inadequacy of the Indian revenue to pay its way.

Moreover it happens that Sir George Campbell had before him only the "regular estimate" for the year 1874-5, and that since his paper was written we have been put in possession of the "closed accounts" for that year. The actual revenue has exceeded the estimated by £500,177, whilst the expenditure is less than was estimated by £167,813; and thus, excluding the cost of public works extraordinary, being capital invested, Sir George Campbell's deficit of £4,526,592 is converted into a surplus of £319,130. But famine charges to the extent of £2,237,860 were debited to the ordinary revenue of the year, and but for this the surplus would have been £2,556,990, which cannot be considered unsatisfactory. I give below a statement which shows the actual results of the Indian revenue and expenditure for the years 1870-1 to 1874-5, and the regular estimated results for 1875-6, which are likely to prove correct, not treating the expenditure on public works extraordinary as a charge against revenue, but stating its amount, and showing what the surplus in each year *would have been but for the famine charges*, and *what it actually was*, these being debited:—

Year.	Surplus excluding Famine Charges.	Surplus including Famine Charges.	Deficit including Famine Charges.	Cost of Famine Relief.	Cost of Public Works extraordinary.
	£	£	£	£	£
1870-1	1,482,990	1,442,990	..	..	1,167,810
1871-2	3,124,177	3,124,177	..	..	1,628,474
1872-3	1,765,672	1,765,672	..	..	2,184,569
1873-4	2,057,005		1,807,668	3,864,673	3,553,307
1874-5	2,556,990	319,130	..	2,237,860	4,249,566
Regular Estimate. <sup>1</sup>					
1875-6	1,903,000	1,247,000	..	656,000	4,143,000
	12,889,834	7,898,969	1,807,668	6,758,533	16,926,726

Budget estimate <sup>2</sup>

1876-7	144,000	144,000	....	....	3,759,000
--------	---------	---------	------	------	-----------

The statement shows the satisfactory surplus of £12,889,834 on the six years, if the famine charge of £6,758,533 is excluded from the account, and £6,091,302, if the whole of this heavy amount is debited to the last three years.

The Budget Estimate for 1876-7 shows only the nominal surplus of £144,000, estimating the loss by exchange at £2,332,000, or near a million more than in the previous year. Let us hope that the growth of the Indian revenue will again, as last year, exceed the estimate, and that a large surplus will accrue. Be that as it may, the loss by the fall in silver is a serious difficulty, and its worst feature is that it is impossible to calculate how far it may go.

It has, however, an equally injurious effect upon our Indian export trade, and, as the amount to be received from India in payment for cotton goods and yarns is, like that which has to be remitted on account of the Indian Government, about £15,000,000, the cotton trade and the Indian Government suffer to the same extent; and the loss by exchange operates as an additional protection, of even heavier weight than the duty, in favour of Indian manufactures.

The loss of the English manufacturer is, of course, no help to the Indian Treasury, but it adds urgency to our protest against the exposure of our Indian trade in cotton textiles to extinction by the continuance of this duty. The Government should remember that if the duty contributes to the loss of this trade, it is at the same time helping to terminate its own existence.

In India the telegraphs, barracks, and other important public works have been constructed entirely out of ordinary revenue, whereas the custom in this country has been always to borrow capital for such purposes; and it cannot be doubted that Indian resources must be more considerable than is supposed by some, for

(1) The loss by exchange on London was £1,425,000.

(2) The estimated loss by exchange is £2,332,000.

they are able to bear a strain which our Chancellor of the Exchequer would never think of imposing upon our own revenue.

The public mind has been misled as to the true position of the Indian exchequer by the statement that there has been no development of the revenue since 1870. The revenue in that year was £50,901,081; in 1875-6 it is estimated at £50,991,060; but those who have put before the public the fact that the figures or actual total of the revenue so nearly correspond in those two years, should not have omitted to state that there was an income tax in 1870 amounting to £1,089,503, which has since been given up; and that in 1872 there was a transference from the Indian imperial revenue to provincial services, to an amount nearly equal to £800,000 a year, whilst, according to Lord Northbrook, the southern customs line has been abolished at a considerable sacrifice of the salt revenue. We have, therefore, a clear loss of about two millions sterling from these causes, and it is most gratifying to find that the other sources of Indian revenue have recuperated sufficiently to make up for the concession of these important items; the state of Indian revenue, therefore, cannot be regarded as calculated to excite the despondency in which some indulge, such considerable progress having been made in so short a time.

It is probably not generally known that the ordinary Indian revenue has had to provide £50,000,000 sterling for expenditure on ordinary public works during the last ten years, and that it was stated in the House of Commons, during the last debate on the Indian budget, by more than one eminent Indian authority, that the public works staff was on a scale of excessive extravagance. It was said that it cost from  $1\frac{1}{4}$  millions to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  millions sterling annually, and the opinion was freely expressed that it ought not to exceed half this sum.

I have endeavoured to show that the Indian import duties on cotton goods are protective, and that they are defended on account of their protective character; that the competition between England and India for the supply of the Indian markets is not, as those combined to defend the tax assert, limited to the coarse trade, but that it is a more serious and vital struggle for the great bulk of our cotton trade with India; that it would be unjust, impolitic, and most unstatesmanlike to expose the capitalists and artisans of England to the obstruction of such an incubus, whatever the position of Indian revenue; and lastly, that the Indian revenue itself is not in such a position of difficulty as to render it impossible to make the concession which sound policy dictates; far otherwise, that it is in a fairly elastic and healthy state, and only requires sound discrimination in the mode of handling it, to render the Indian exchequer one of the most prosperous.

R. RAYNSFORD JACKSON.

## THE LAWS ON COMPULSORY EDUCATION.

THE purpose of this article is to collect and compare the several enactments relating to compulsory education, and to show how far, when thus looked at together, they appear a satisfactory body of law. It would be beside this purpose to enter directly upon the abstract questions connected with compulsion. The question, for example, which is at the root of the matter—the question how far interference by governments with the freedom of parents is desirable or defensible—may here be entirely passed over. The mere existence of the enactments to be examined proves that, with us, this is not an open question. It has, in fact, been practically settled since the year 1802. Ever since, there has been growing up among us that great fabric of State interference which it is our purpose here to describe; and, from the day when that fabric was founded, the question was settled for ever. For the growth of the fabric to completion was merely a matter of time. When once the State had insisted upon the children in one trade being educated, it was impossible that to them should remain confined a benefit equally needed by the children in all other trades; and when once children had been forced to school from working in useful employments, to let the idle and unproductive children go free was an anomaly that could not endure.

Probably few people are aware how great a mass of law upon our subject has now grown up—of confused and complicated law, embodied in a multiplicity of Acts, which represent various distinct branches of legislation, and which certainly show no agreement and perhaps show some actual conflict.

The following is a list of the enactments which it is here proposed to examine:—

1. The Factory and Workshop Acts, 1833 to 1874, fourteen in number.

2. The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1872.

3. The Agricultural Children Act, 1873.

4. An enactment regarding out-door relief (Education Act, 1873, section 3).

5. The Elementary Education Acts, 1870 and 1873; and the School Board Bye-laws made under them.

The first remark which this list suggests is that the law seems capable of arrangement under two separate heads—the exclusively educational, providing for direct compulsion; and the incidentally educational, attaching an educational condition to the enjoyment of

some benefit. The Education Acts and Bye-laws seem to fall under the former head, and all the Acts regulating labour under the latter. But this logical arrangement is spoiled by the introduction into the Education Act, 1873, of the provision which stands fourth on the list; for this provision, attaching an educational condition to the receipt of out-door relief, is clearly a measure, not of direct, but of indirect, compulsion. It may further be remarked, with regard to the suggested division, that the Agricultural Children Act stands almost upon the dividing line. It is a measure of indirect compulsion, but it cannot be fairly described as a measure only incidentally educational. The other Labour Acts, above enumerated, may correctly be so described, for they impose several limitations and conditions, beside the educational condition, upon the use of a child's labour; but the Agricultural Act imposes no limitation upon it, except that the child must be at least eight years old, and subjects it to absolutely no condition other than the educational. This Act, then, is as nearly as possible of an exclusively educational character.

One more remark upon the list, before individually examining its contents. It takes no account of (1) criminal children, compulsorily educated in reformatories under the "Reformatory Schools Acts 1866 and 1872;" (2) vagrant, homeless and beggar children, or children charged before the magistrates with certain minor offences, or found in the company of thieves, or pronounced refractory and unmanageable; who are subject to compulsory education in industrial schools under the "Industrial Schools' Acts 1866 and 1872;" (3) pauper children, compulsorily educated in workhouses, district schools, and training ships. These classes of children come under special kinds of compulsion which may be omitted from this general review. They are put under a special treatment—not merely educated but also fed, clothed, and lodged. As to the reformatory children, they are in no way connected with the compulsory systems here to be reviewed, and not at all likely to be affected by any change of the law of compulsion. The industrial schools, on the other hand, are connected with the school board system of compulsion, and may be affected by a change of the law. Not only may these schools be established and maintained by school boards, but they are also very largely recruited by school board agency. This, no doubt, is one reason why industrial schools have greatly multiplied of late, while reformatories have been almost stationary. Indeed, the Inspector, in his Report for 1875, specially called attention to what he considered the "misuse" of industrial schools by their being made into "schools of compulsory education for the ignorant and uncontrollable." Regarding such schools as primarily intended to check crime—as, in his own words, "preventive and correctional institu-

tions—" he objects to the use made of them by school boards in order to supply certain deficiencies which experience has found in the Education Acts. For, under the Education Acts, boards can only proceed against the parent: they cannot deal directly with the child, and take him into their own guardianship. But they find many cases, in which the child either has no "proper guardianship," or has a parent or guardian who represents "that he is unable to control" him, and, in such cases, the boards avail themselves of the Industrial Schools Act to secure for the child an education, which they could not prevail on the guardian to give him, or which he would himself evade by habitual and incorrigible truancy. The use so made of industrial schools by school boards is large and increasing. Thus, during four years the following numbers of children, respectively, were sent by the London School Board to industrial schools, 228, 503, 627, and 608; and the board has now six officers employed in sending fit cases to such schools. But the Industrial Schools Act does not exactly answer the purpose. The shortest term of detention which it contemplates, is a period of eighteen months, and where boards procure the committal of those children, whom Lord Sandon has taught us to call "wastrels," shorter terms would often be preferable. Enforced separations of parents from children should obviously be as short as possible; and the law should avoid offering facilities to parents for escaping responsibility by handing over their children into bondage. Hence the Education Bill now before the House provides for committals to industrial schools for periods so short as one month.

1. The Factory Acts, which stand at the head of our list, have been described as fourteen in number and as extending from 1833 to 1874. This by no means includes all that have been passed, but those which it omits have, with one exception, been repealed. This one, although practically obsolete, deserves attention as first of the series. This is the Act of 1802, passed under the Addington Administration, by the first Sir Robert Peel. Its educational provisions are as follows:—Apprentices in cotton and woollen mills shall, during the first four years of their apprenticeship, be taught "reading, writing, and arithmetic, or either of them," upon every working day, during the hours of work, by a teacher provided and paid by their employer; also, they shall receive religious instruction for an hour every Sunday, and, if members of the Church of England, shall be examined once a year by the parochial clergyman, and, when of fit age, be presented for confirmation; also, they shall be made to attend divine service at least once a month.

These provisions differ from those of the later unrepealed Acts in that (1) the persons who are the objects of them, the "apprentices," are not defined by age or otherwise; (2) the time during which they

are to be under instruction on each working day is not specified; (3) no mention is made of schools as separate institutions—the instruction is to be given within the mill; (4) it is not made the duty of any Government officer to see that the law is observed: it is merely enjoined upon the justices of the peace to make arrangements for ensuring its observance; (5) this alone of the Factory Acts makes provision for religious instruction.

In the thirty years following 1802 six Acts were passed for the further regulation of cotton factories; but these Acts related almost wholly to hours of work and sanitary rules, and, educationally, added nothing to the provisions of 1802. The first of the six, indeed, passed in 1819, made an important step towards our present factory law in its educational bearings, by fixing an age under which children might not be employed. The age so fixed was nine—an age retained in the Act of 1831, which, coming last of the six Acts above referred to, repealed all preceding Factory Acts, except the Act of 1802, but was itself repealed, two years later, by an Act which (although practically superseded so far as regards its educational provisions) is still unrepealed, and is regarded as the foundation of the present factory law. This Act is the Act of 1833, brought in by Lord Ashley (the present Lord Shaftesbury), and taken up and with some modifications passed—one of the firstfruits of the Reform Bill—by Lord Althorp, then leader of the House of Commons. This Act, after reciting in words applicable to the Agricultural Children Act, that the provisions of the Act of 1802 had been evaded “partly in consequence of the want of the appointment of proper visitors or officers whose special duty it was to enforce their execution,” proceeds to provide for the appointment of Inspectors of Factories who are to require the observance of the educational, as well as of the other, regulations of the Act. These educational regulations are as follows:—Children from nine years of age (the earliest age at which employment in factories is by this Act permitted) up to thirteen years of age are to attend during at least two hours a day upon six days of every week at a school chosen by the parents, or, in default of such choice, appointed by the Inspector. In the latter case, the Inspector may order the employer to deduct from the child’s wages a sum not exceeding one-twelfth of them, and to pay the same to the school-teacher. If the Inspector thinks the teacher incompetent, he may stop this payment. If he thinks an additional school requisite, he may “establish or procure the establishment of such school” out of (presumably, but the Act is not clear on this point) the fines imposed upon parents and employers; for both were made liable to fines, the parents up to twenty shillings, the employers up to twenty pounds. This Act applies to nearly all the textile manufactures—cotton, woollen, worsted, hemp, flax, tow, linen, or silk.

The advances made by the above provisions beyond the Act of 1802 were great. First, there was the institution of Inspectors. Second, there was the definition of school-age by the same method as has been used in subsequent Factory Acts; that is to say, by the fixing of a limit of age under which children could not be employed, and of another limit beyond which they ceased to be "children" and became "young persons"—a promotion which emancipated them from school. Third, it was recognised to be the parent's duty, as well as the employer's, to see that the child was educated, and to be the parent's right to select the school; for the Act of 1802, in its directions and penalties, had regard to the employer only, and, as we have observed, nothing was said in it about choice of schools, probably because, in those days, there were in most places no schools to choose between. Fourth, some sort of consideration was to be given to the question whether the teacher could teach or not. The Act of 1802 had laid down, indeed, that he was to be a "discreet and proper person;" but by whom and how his discretion and propriety were to be tested was very insufficiently, if at all, indicated. Fifth, there was some sort of feeble provision for the supply of additional school-accommodation where it was wanted.

The next Factory Act, passed by Sir James Graham under Sir Robert Peel's administration in 1844, is so far in force to this day as to be of the highest importance. Like the preceding Act, it applies to the textile manufactures, and, by the inclusion of hair and jute, completes the list of them. Its educational provisions are as follows:—Children from eight years of age (when their employment, by this Act, was allowed to commence—a year earlier than had been allowed by the Act of 1833) up to thirteen years of age are to be made by their parents to attend school in either of the two following ways:—(1) If the children be employed every day, they must attend school every day, except Saturday, for three continuous hours, or, in winter afternoons, for two hours and a half; (2) if they be employed only upon every second day, they must upon the alternate days, except Saturday, attend school for five hours a day. The employer, if required by the Inspector, must pay school-fees up to the amount of twopence a week for each child, and may, for the purpose of this payment, deduct from the child's wages a part not exceeding one-twelfth. The Inspector may refuse to recognise attendance at a school pronounced by him to be grossly inefficient, but must not do so without naming another school for the children; which other school must be within two miles of the factory. The penalties, for employers, may range between one pound and three; for parents, between five shillings and a pound.

This Act virtually repealed, by entirely superseding, the rules for school-attendance contained in the Act of 1833; and by its new



rules upon this subject, together with its directions limiting the hours of employment, it led to the use of double sets, or "shifts," of children, alternately relieving each other, and thereby invented the "half-timer." A high authority, indeed (Mr. Redgrave), states that the Act of 1833 had "rendered a double set of children necessary," and adds the remark, interesting as explanatory of the legislation of 1844, that it was in consequence of "the great effect thus produced upon the supply of labour that the subsequent Act (1844) permitted the employment of children at eight years of age," instead of nine. But I am supported by the recent Factory Commission in pronouncing the half-timer, as now understood, to be the invention of 1844 rather than of 1833 (Report, vol. i., p. lx.).

The Act of 1844 was followed in 1846, 1850, 1853, 1856, 1861, and 1864 by a series of Acts which did not alter its educational provisions, and of which we need only sum up the results. Ropewalks were specially exempted from it in 1846, only, however, to fall under it again in 1867, so far as they are covered by the general words, below quoted, of the "Factory Acts Extension Act 1867." The Acts of 1850, 1853, and 1856 were entirely without educational purpose or effect. The Act of 1861 brought lace factories under the educational and other provisions of the Act of 1844; and, in 1864, those provisions were extended to the following miscellaneous list of trades: the manufactures of earthenware, lucifer matches, percussion caps, and cartridges, and the employments of paper-staining and fustian-cutting. In 1867, the Act of 1844 gained a still wider comprehensiveness by the Extension Act above referred to; which, after specially subjecting to it all sorts of iron, copper, steel, gutta percha, and india rubber works, the manufactures of paper, glass, and tobacco, and the employments of printing and bookbinding, declared it, in general terms, to apply to "any premises in the same occupation, within the precincts of which fifty or more persons are employed in any manufacturing process."

. In this year, 1867, a year memorable in the history of indirect compulsion, there was also passed, by Lord Derby's Government, the "Workshops Regulation Act." This Act was passed in consequence of the Report of the Children's Employment Commission, 1862-67, which had pointed out that the result of "extending the Factory Acts to large establishments, while omitting the smaller, would be to drive away work from large and generally well-conducted establishments into places less healthy and worse regulated" (Factory Commission, 1876, Report, vol. i., p. xciv.). The Act defines a "workshop" as "any place whatever in which any handicraft is carried on by any child, young person, or woman," and defines "handicraft" in the same elaborately comprehensive terms, which are used in the Extension Act just described as a definition

for "manufacturing process." Thus, "workshops" do not differ in kind from establishments to which the Factory Acts are extended. Since, however, establishments subject to the Factory Acts are exempted from the Workshop Act, the application of that Act is limited (with a few exceptions) to establishments which belong to industries not expressly referred to in the Factory Acts, and which, by reason of their employing less than fifty hands, are not brought under the Factory Acts by the general words above quoted, of the "Factory Acts Extension Act, 1867." To all such small establishments, except bakehouses, the Workshop Act applies. Its provisions, so far as they concern us, are as follows. It allows children to be employed at eight years of age, like the Factory Act of 1844. From eight up to thirteen, children are to be made by their parents to attend school at least ten hours a week, unless there is no school within a mile. As under the Factory Act, the employer must pay the school-fees, if required so to do, up to twopence a week, and may deduct one-twelfth of the child's wages for this purpose. If a school is pronounced grossly inefficient by an Inspector of Factories, attendance at it may not be accepted under this Act any more than under the Factory Act, unless there is no other school within a mile. The Inspectors of Factories, however, were not named in the Workshop Act as the authorities to work it. It was to be enforced in different localities by different local authorities, Sewer Commissioners, Vestries, Town Councils, Local Boards, and Improvement Commissioners.

In 1870, the "Extension Act 1867," above mentioned, was itself extended to print works and bleaching and dyeing works; which had been expressly excepted from it by its fifth section. Thus these industries also were brought under the educational provisions of 1844. In 1871 the enforcement of the Workshop Act was taken from the local authorities, above referred to, and was given to the Inspectors of Factories. The local authorities had almost universally failed to enforce the Act—a failure which was not without its significance as a guide for future legislation.

We now come to the last of the series of Factory Acts, taken up by the present Government from its introducer, Mr. Mundella, and passed with some modifications by Mr. Cross in 1874. It made some important educational changes, but its operation is limited to the textile factories as defined in the Act of 1844, and, with the exception of lace works, does not affect any of the industries subsequently brought under that Act. The provisions of 1874, so far as they concern education, are as follows:—They forbid the employment of children under ten, and declare childhood to last till fourteen, thus altering the factory school-age from the period between eight and thirteen to the period between ten and fourteen, and thereby, it will

be observed, making it shorter by a year. Further, a "child" may still become a "young person" under these provisions at thirteen, and thenceforth be free of school, if certified by the Education Department to have attained a certain educational standard: so the school-age under this Act need not necessarily be longer than from ten to thirteen. Children within the meaning of the Act must attend school in either of the two ways specified in the Act of 1844; but with this difference, that the school must be one recognised by the Education Department as efficient. A child may, however, attend a school not so recognised, provided that either (1) the school-district (under the Education Acts), in which such school is situated, has not been declared by the Education Department to be sufficiently provided with school-accommodation, or (2) there is no school recognised by the Department within two miles of the factory.

The former of these two provisos is strangely drawn. As it stands, a factory child, although the factory is in a district amply supplied with recognised schools, may pass by these efficient schools and go to an unrecognised school in an adjoining school-district (and the lax conduct of the inefficient schools is often no small inducement), provided that such adjoining district be insufficiently supplied with school-accommodation. One would have thought the material point to be, not whether the *school* was, but whether the *factory and the child's home* were, in a district sufficiently provided with recognised schools. The two provisos might thus have exhausted between them the reasonable grounds for attendance at an unrecognised school. The first proviso would have said, "A child need not go to a recognised school, if he works in a district which has not got room enough in its recognised schools for all its children:" the second would have added, "he need not attend a recognised school, even though he works in a district with room enough for all its children in its recognised schools, unless one of those schools is within two miles of him."

Again, a question arises, whether this proviso does not nullify the enactment. Our factories are mostly situated in the big, growing boroughs, and it may be doubted whether many of these can ever be pronounced by the Education Department "sufficiently provided with public school-accommodation." Their rapid increase makes such a declaration difficult; and if in the case of any borough such a declaration were made, an unfortunate consequence would appear to ensue. The school board of such borough would seem to be thenceforward debarred from borrowing money. For boards can only borrow with the consent of the Education Department and for the purpose of supplying public school-accommodation. Now the Department can only consent when they are satisfied that the school-accommodation which the board proposes to supply "is required in

order to provide for the educational wants of the district" (Education Act 1873, §10). But if the Department acting under this Factory Act declared a district "sufficiently provided with public school-accommodation," it is difficult to see how they could afterwards be satisfied that any additional school-accommodation, which the board proposed to supply, was "required in order to provide for the educational wants of the district," or how, if not so satisfied, they could consent to a loan. Thus we seem to be in a dilemma with regard to this enactment requiring attendance at a recognised school. The requirement cannot be enforced without the making of a certain declaration most difficult to make in those districts in which it is of most importance that the requirement should be enforced; and if in any of those districts the declaration were made, the consequence, certainly untoward, would seem to ensue, that the school board of that district could not borrow any more money.

This Act of 1874, it will be observed, postpones (1) the commencement of labour from eight to ten, (2) the commencement of full-time labour from thirteen to fourteen, unless the child pass an examination at thirteen. Whether the former alteration is to be an educational gain or not, depends upon what is done for enforcing school-attendance up to ten. If nothing were done, the alteration would be an educational loss: for, generally, the future half-timer puts off school until he enters the mill. The second alteration is reported by the Factory Commission to be no educational gain. At present, this is the only Act which tries to stretch the school age beyond thirteen. And such isolated endeavour must fail: all advance must be along the whole line. Children who cannot pass the examination, and thereby become full-timers at thirteen, will not, says the Report, continue as half-timers. They will simply go to some occupation not subject to this Act, or, possibly, remain unemployed. Having reached thirteen, they are safe from school-boards—safe, indeed, when they get from under this Act, from every existing form of compulsion.

Having now shortly reviewed the Factory and Workshop Acts, we may consider how far they exhibit that complexity and confusion which we stated to be characteristic of our law of compulsory education. Viewed in regard to the whole body of their provisions, these Acts have been universally denounced—by Mr. Cross no less than by Mr. Mundella—as complicated to the very verge of unintelligibility. "A more confused jumble of legislative enactments does not exist in the Statute Book," says Mr. Redgrave, Inspector of Factories, quoting from a high legal authority. Here, however, where we need only view the Acts in regard to their educational provisions, we need only ask, whether any of the complexity thus attributed to the Acts is observable in this particular part of them:

Let us take a few instances and see. A is a boy of nine, employed in a print-works factory: what are the educational provisions applicable to him? First, we look at the latest and lastly-described Factory Act, and we find that print-works are not subject to it; for it only affects industries regulated by the "Factory Acts 1833 to 1856" and the "Lace Factory Act 1861," and, on reference to those Acts, we discover that print-works are not among such industries. Thus driven from the latest of the series, we look back through the Factory Acts in search of something applicable to our boy; and we find that in 1870 print-works were specially provided for by the "Factory and Workshop Act 1870," to which allusion has above been made. This Act, however, contained no educational provisions. It merely repealed certain Acts relating to print-works, which would, if unrepealed, have answered our question; and, in lieu of those Acts so repealed, it placed print-works under the "Factory Acts Extension Act, 1867." But our search does not end with this Act of 1867; for it also, as we have seen, contains no educational provisions. It only brings the industries to which it applies under several earlier Acts, and, on looking back through these, we at length make out that A's education is regulated by the Factory Act 1844, and that he must therefore attend school in either of the two ways there prescribed. B is another boy of nine, resident in a town where the only mills are textile factories subject to the Act of 1874. As children under ten cannot be employed in such factories, he escapes compulsory education under the Labour Acts, though he is not less fit to work and not less in want of education than A. C lives in the same town as B, but, being eleven, can work in the mills. So he must attend school as much as A; but since C's mill is under the Act of 1874 and A's under the Act of 1844, they get different kinds of schooling. C must go to a school recognised by the Education Department; but a school, of which the teacher has not been pronounced grossly incompetent by the Inspector of Factories, is good enough for A, although it may have been declared inefficient by the Inspector of Schools, and although the Inspector of Factories, who lets it pass uncondemned, may have been appointed (if for any special qualification) for his surgical or mechanical knowledge, and without any regard to his capability of determining the worth of a school. Again, C must attend school until he is fourteen; while A can cease from attending at thirteen. D, a fourth boy, works at an industry not specially referred to by the Factory Acts, and in an establishment employing only forty-nine hands. He falls under the Workshop Act. Two days a week is all the schooling the law requires for him. D's brother, E, works next door, at the same trade, but in a bigger establishment, employing fifty-one hands. Such an establishment is, as we have seen, brought by the Extension Act, 1867,

under the Factory Acts; and so E gets half-time schooling daily. The legislature has decreed that the two more hands employed in E's establishment shall give him considerable educational advantages over D; and we can only hope that D's confidence in the wisdom of Parliament remains unabated. F and G are another pair of brothers, both working at a biscuit factory. F works in the part of the Factory where they bake the biscuits. This part is clearly a "Bakehouse" within the meaning of the "Bakehouses Act, 1863," and, as such, is, as we have seen, excepted from the "Workshop Act, 1867." Now the Bakehouses Act has no educational provisions at all. Hence, F has no schooling at all guaranteed to him. G works in another room of the establishment which contains no ovens, and over which the Inspectors of Factories have therefore been able to push their authority under the Workshop Act. So he gets his two days a week in school. But the ovens in the room with F debar him from all educational privileges; and, indeed, by putting him under an Act which is lax in its provisions and loosely worked—being still confided to "local authorities"—these ovens expose him to various other inconveniences. Delicate children, whose employment for ten hours a day in the lighter processes of biscuit making has been disallowed, are occasionally, says a Sub-inspector of Factories, (see Factory Commission Report, vol. i., p. xviii.) "sent down into the bakehouse where they can be employed apparently for sixteen hours at a stretch. This arrangement, I am informed, is facetiously described as 'putting them into the hot-house to mature.'" Such genial and kindly banter must do much to console the poor victims.

Again, the limits, by which school-age is bounded under the Factory Acts, are more various than the above sketch could point out. We have seen that the "child" of the Act of 1844 is between eight and thirteen; of the Act of 1874, is between ten and fourteen, unless, by attaining a certain educational standard, he can constitute himself a "young person" at thirteen. We may add that, by special provisions affecting certain trades, employment is made to commence even later than ten. Thus, in fustian-cutting, the "child" is from eleven to thirteen; and in metal-grinding childhood is similarly bounded; while in glass-melting (from which girls are excluded) the "child" is a boy between twelve and thirteen. In brick-making, from which also girls are excluded, the "child" is a boy between ten and thirteen. Similarly, the other Labour Acts, which we are about to consider, define childhood in their own various fashions. They say "it is a wise child that knows its own father:" but what shall be said of the wisdom of a father who, in spite of this variety of definition, knows whether his own offspring is a "child," or not?

These are a few of the complexities of these Acts. With regard to their educational efficiency, much evidence has lately been taken by a Commission, whose report, admirably drawn up by their Secretary (Sir George Young), has already been often referred to. The results of the evidence may be thus summed up. The half-time school-attendance under the Factory Acts has done good service, especially the half-day attendance, which is much more useful (and, luckily, much more common) than the alternate-day attendance. The Workshop Act has, on the other hand, been educationally valueless. The school-attendance of ten hours a week prescribed by it would, if enforced, be insufficient for the children, and most detrimental to any well-organised school which consented to admit them. This, of course, assumes that the attendance is made cumulatively as the Act permits—is crowded into two days, in fact—and is not spread out over the week. Such cumulative attendance is bad for the progress both of the children and of the school which admits them. Nor is even this attendance enforced. The inspection of the factories is effective; but the workshops are, both in the serious and slang sense, far too many for the Inspectors. Besides, the Workshop Act is full of flaws. It requires no proof of age, either from registrar or surgeon. In the factories there is cheating enough about age; but in the workshops there is not even the surgeon to look into the child's mouth, in the veterinary-like factory-fashion, and guess what the age is from the teeth. Again, the ten-hours attendance is only required in a week during the whole of which the child has been employed in the workshop, so that any break in the employment, however small, altogether releases from the requirement. Fortunately, in some places—in Sheffield for instance—where there is a general desire for education, employers make the workshop children attend half-time, as if they were factory children; but no thanks to the Workshop Act for that. In such places, the two classes of children are taught together, and are not distinguishable from each other, in the Public Elementary Schools. In fact, the Inspectors of Schools know nothing of ten-hours children; for the workshop children who avail themselves of their Act to attend merely during this *minimum* time do not go to inspected schools but to Adventure Schools, or, as Mr. Mundella prefers to call them, "Evasion Schools."

2. Second to the "Factory and Workshop Acts" upon our list comes the "Coal Mines Regulation Act 1872." The legislation which led up to this Act resembles the Factory legislation in that it began by being generally humanitarian, and has recently become more and more specially educational. The first Act we have to mention was passed in 1842, and, like the Factory Act of 1833, was one of Lord Shaftesbury's services to the cause of humanity. Armed with the

report of a Commission, which had been inquiring about mining, and which, among other horrors justifying Lord Shaftesbury's designation of their report as "that terrible document," stated, that infants of four years old were to be found working in the depths of our collieries, Lord Shaftesbury passed an Act prohibiting all females, and all boys under ten years of age, from being employed underground. In 1850 and 1855 further Acts were passed, attempting to establish an efficient system of mine inspection. In 1860 Sir George Cornewall Lewis passed the first Act containing educational provisions applicable to mines. The existing law, that no boy under ten was to be employed underground, was re-enacted, and a further enactment was added, that no boy under twelve was to be employed underground unless the employer had obtained a certificate "under the hand of a competent schoolmaster" to the effect either that the boy could read and write, or that he had attended school for three hours a day, on two days a week, during the preceding month. These provisions naturally proved to be of no educational use whatsoever. Lord Morley described them to the House of Lords as the "merest farce" in the course of introducing the Act of 1872 with an interesting review of the Acts that had preceded it. In 1872 two Mine Acts were passed by Mr. Bruce (Lord Aberdare): one for Coal Mines, the other for Metalliferous Mines. The latter, which prohibited all females, and all boys under twelve, from working underground, contained no educational provisions. The idea of the Legislature appears to have been, that the boys between twelve and thirteen employed underground, and all children employed "on the bank," would be educationally provided for by the Factory and Workshop Acts, or by the direct compulsion of school boards. The Coal Mines Act, on the other hand, permitted the employment underground of boys between ten and twelve where the coal-seams were thin, and for such boys made some educational provision. They must attend school, if there is one within two miles, during twenty hours every fortnight, and of these twenty hours not more than three may be continuous, not more than five may be in one day, not more than twelve in one week. The employer must, if required to do so, pay the boy's school-fees up to two-pence a week, and may deduct from the boy's wages any sum so paid up to one-twelfth of those wages. The Inspector of Mines may refuse to accept attendance at a school pronounced inefficient by him, but such refusal is subject to an appeal to the Education Department (under the Factory Act 1844 and the Workshop Act, appeals in similar cases lie to the Home Office), and can only take effect when there is another school for the children to attend within two miles.

It will be observed, that these educational provisions are in the main modelled upon the Workshop Act. That Act requires an attendance of ten hours a week; this Act requires an attendance of



twenty hours a fortnight. The reason why the cumulative system of attendance was, with some limitations, adopted in this Act, is said to have been, that the danger arising from very frequent ascents and descents of the mine-shafts might be avoided. Whatever the reason for its adoption, the system has unquestionably failed. So far as education is concerned, the Coal Mines Regulation Act may be asserted to have all the faults of the Workshop Act, besides some of its own. It only professes to provide for the education of children up to twelve years of age, while the Workshop Act provides for them up to thirteen. "The Mines Act," says an Inspector of Factories, "allowing a child to work full time at twelve, makes a coal-mine a refuge for any child who gets punished for failing to attend regularly at school, *i.e.*, a refuge for those children who stand most in need of education. This privilege undoes much of the good wrought by the Factory Acts." All the other Inspectors of Factories bear similar testimony. Again, with regard to children employed "on the bank" at mines, there is a conflict of jurisdiction between the Inspectors of Mines and of Factories, the consequence of which is that the children are not looked after by either. Mr. Oakeley, Inspector of Schools in Durham, who alike from the position of his district and from his own ability is probably the best qualified person in the country to pronounce an opinion upon the subject, declared the Act a failure, educationally, in 1873, and has only been confirmed in this view by his two years of subsequent experience. The Inspectors of Mines have too many other duties to be able to attend to education, even if they knew how; and the Colliery schoolmasters naturally like to work amicably with the Colliery "viewers," by whom they are appointed. The consequence is, that the Act, which at best could do little for education, is systematically violated.

3. Third upon our list comes the "Agricultural Children Act 1873." Its provisions, shortly stated, are as follows:—Children under eight may not be employed in agriculture, except by the parent, on his own land. Children between eight and twelve may not be employed, unless the parent has obtained, and the employer has seen, a certificate, dated not more than a year previous to the employment, certifying the age of the child and that the child, if the age is under ten, has attended school two hundred and fifty times, if the age is over ten, one hundred and fifty times, during the year preceding the date of the certificate. The school attended must be a school recognised by the Education Department or the Local Government Board, unless there is no such school within two miles of the child's home. Children are exempt from the above requirement if certified by the Inspector of Schools to have "reached" (which the Education Department interprets to mean "passed in

all the three elementary subjects" under) Standard IV. In "agricultural gangs," no child is to be employed under ten. There are certain provisos (not greatly needed) to prevent the Act from working too stringently; the penalties are not to exceed, for employers £5, for other persons (presumably parents) £1, but may be as low as the magistrates please; and there is nobody appointed to work the Act.

It may be observed that this Act was introduced by a leading Conservative, the representative farmer, Mr. C. S. Read, and that, in introducing it, he hardly claimed that it was likely to effect much. He called it "an extension of the principles of the Factory Acts, in a mitigated form, to agriculture;" and, in defence of the very mitigated form indeed in which his Bill embodied those principles, he urged that "employment in farming operations, being essentially healthy," did not need much limitation. Indeed, the way he played fast-and-loose with "the principles of the Factory Acts" is worthy of observation. When excusing his Bill for permitting employment at so early an age as eight, he thought "it would not be wise to alter the Factory Acts and the other statutes which start at the age of eight;" but, when excusing it for not having made its educational provisions extend, like the Factory Acts, up to the age of thirteen, he frankly affirmed: "My answer is, that I do not think there is any reason why a child who has reached the age of twelve should not have received ample education . . . In illustration of what I am advancing, I may state that there is a boy upon my farm who is assisting his father in attending to my bullocks. This boy can do sums in vulgar fractions, and I am sure that he could pass a school-examination better than I could, although that, perhaps, may be no great commendation for him, and he is just twelve years old."

This boy who is "attending to bullocks," and certain other children working in "market-gardens and orchards," whom Mr. Read cited as instances of the class who would come under his Act, lead us to point out, that, if the Act worked, it would be necessary to settle what "agricultural work" was. Is gardening agriculture, or is horticulture to be distinguished from agriculture, and, if so, is a market-garden, or an orchard, to be regarded as "ager" or as "hortus?" Is Mr. Read certain that his typical children "gathering apples in orchards" are doing "agricultural work?" And as to that boy "attending to bullocks," surely when so engaged he is pursuing a pastoral vocation, and is no more doing "agricultural work" than when he is engaged upon his vulgar fractions. "Barking" and "acorning"—occupations, which, according to the School Inspectors, employ great numbers of country children—are they to be held "agricultural"?

If the Act worked, on questions so trivial would depend the momentous issue for thousands of children, whether they were to get some education or none. The "Agricultural Children Act" is the only law of compulsory education applicable to nine-tenths of the country, and only those children who are doing "agricultural work" can profit by its provisions.

We say advisedly "*some* education or none;" for, in truth, all they would get under this Act, if it worked, would be little worth. Take an instance:—A certificate issued on the 28th of February, 1876, stating that A.B., a boy certified to be ten years of age, had attended school one hundred and fifty times since the 1st of February, 1875, would be in force for one year from the date of its issue—that is to say, until the 28th of February, 1877, and would therefore enable a farmer to employ A.B. up to that date—say, for instance, during the first two months of 1877. Now, since A.B. could have made his one hundred and fifty attendances in fifteen weeks, he might have got them over by the middle of June, 1875. So he might thus be working for two months of 1877 without any contravention of the Act, although he had not been inside a school during the whole year 1876, or during the last six months of 1875.

But the Act does *not* work. If it was only a failure, no harm, at least, might have been done. But the worst of it is, that, just at first, the people in many districts believed in it, and the schools were suddenly crowded with rough, untaught children, come to qualify themselves for employment under the new law. The effect was bad on the schools, and was worse upon the people; for soon they came to discover that the children who had not gone to school were in no way worse off in respect to employment than those who had gone, and that parents and employers who had tried to keep the law were simply laughed at for their pains. Of course, the sudden influx to the schools quickly abated, and then ceased; and a general feeling against compulsory education, as a poor sort of sham, was very widely created. It is in evidence, that in some parts of the country the people now do not believe there was any such Act. They think it was the "Mrs. Harris" of compulsory legislation, a figment of the parson's brain, paraded before them in order to feed the Church school and thereby (for there is a popular impression that attendance at the Church school in some mysterious way benefits the parson) to do good to himself. It would have been far better for education if this Act had never passed. The Education Bill now proposes to repeal it; and no Act could be repealed with less loss.

4. The fourth law upon our list is the enactment relating to out-door relief. By the Act known as Denison's Act, Guardians were permitted to pay school-fees for the children of persons receiving out-door relief, but were not permitted to make the attendance at

school of such children a condition of the relief. The third section of the Elementary Education Act 1873, repeals Denison's Act, and makes it a condition of continuous out-door relief that for every child between five and thirteen years of age of the person so relieved "education in reading, writing, and arithmetic shall be provided," unless the child (1) falls within certain cases excused by section 74 of the Education Act 1870 from having to attend school under a school board bye-law, or (2) has reached a certain prescribed educational standard, or (3) is being educated under the Agricultural Children Act.

Of all the enactments of compulsory education this is one of the most curiously fashioned. The main direction says nothing about any particular school, or, indeed, about any school at all. But attached to it are provisos and exceptions which do not in the least fit in with it, and which seem very clearly to contemplate attendance at a Public Elementary School; that is to say, a school which conforms with all the conditions of the Government annual grants. Not unnaturally the guardians have been puzzled as to where, and how, the prescribed "education in reading, writing, and arithmetic" should "be provided." The Local Government Board cuts the knot for them, instructing them, in some published letters, that it must be provided in a Public Elementary School. The governing words of the section seem thus to have a good deal put into them which is taken from the provisos and exceptions; though the virtue of these latter is usually held to be merely to limit and modify. And the provisos are strange things themselves. The words "or refused," thrown apparently at random into one of them, makes it not English and hardly intelligible. The Government Education Bill, which proposes to repeal this enactment, substitutes for it one more clearly expressed.

Further, the law has not worked without friction. The schools to which these out-door pauper children have been sent by the Guardians have very frequently, and not unnaturally, objected to receiving them; and cases have been made public in which the law is alleged to have occasioned much hardship. In fact, so doubtful a gain is the enactment, that some Boards of Guardians have declared in favour of its repeal, and recently we find the Salford School Board passing a resolution to the following effect:—"That the Board desires to express its concurrence in the resolution of the Guardians of the Chorlton Union—namely, that the provisions of the Education Act 1873, § 3, making the education of every child between five and thirteen years of age a condition of out-door relief, is one that in many cases inflicts an amount of hardship altogether disproportionate to any advantages to be obtained by thus indirectly enforcing education." (See *Manchester Examiner* of March 10th.) And indeed this

enactment, most illogically introduced (as we have seen) into the Act in which it finds place, is compulsion in a revolting form. The essence of indirect compulsion is the attaching of an educational condition to the enjoyment of some benefit. In the case of all other enactments of indirect compulsion, the benefit is one of which the community may, without cruelty, deprive him who shirks the condition. It is the use of a child's labour, or earnings. But, in this case, the benefit is bare subsistence. In this enactment, the community says to the parent who cannot support himself and his family, "I am still afraid to make compulsion general; but of you, at least, I am not afraid. You are down. I can compel you, and I will. Educate your child, then, or I will let you starve." This indeed is compulsion—compulsion with a touch of class-legislation. In practice, of course, the relieving officers do not let the recalcitrant parent starve; but, in strict pursuance of this enactment, they should offer him either starvation or the workhouse.

5. Last upon our list come the Education Acts and the bye-laws made under them by school boards. By the last printed return (April, 1876) it appears that, of 14,307 school-districts in England and Wales, 2,264 are now under school boards. As in many cases two or more districts are under one board, the number of boards is less than 2,264—is, in fact, only 1,653. Of these 1,653 only 527 have passed bye-laws enabling them to compel children to go to school; but inasmuch as the boards of nearly all the large boroughs have passed such bye-laws, the total population under bye-laws is not very much smaller than the total population under boards. The figures stand thus:—Total population of England and Wales in 1871, 22,712, 266; total population now under boards, 12,522,537; total population under bye-laws, 10,467,615. Nearly all the earliest-formed boards have passed bye-laws. Thus of twenty-six boards formed in 1870 only one (the borough of Cardigan) would appear not to have passed bye-laws. Of 312 boards formed in 1871 eighty-four have not passed bye-laws; and of these eighty-four, curiously enough, fifty-two are in Wales; while a large proportion of the rest are in Cornwall and other parts of the country where Nonconformists abound. In such parts, it may be inferred, a board was rather for attack upon the Church than for forcing children to school. Of the more recently-formed boards, a steadily-increasing number in proportion to the lateness of their formation have not yet passed bye-laws. Of course, many of these may be preparing bye-laws and may be expected soon to pass them; but it should be remembered that the boards formed recently and now being formed are for the most part formed compulsorily—forced upon the districts in order to supply deficiencies of school-accommodation—and that, among such boards, we can hardly look

for the educational zeal evinced by the earliest-formed boards, which were formed in obedience to the request of the districts. We therefore need not be surprised to find that less than one-third of the boards existing in April last had passed bye-laws.

A further diversity is introduced by the differences between the bye-laws of different boards. On this point, as it would be impossible to attempt an analysis of 527 sets of bye-laws, I will merely quote some remarks from Mr. Owen's excellent "Education Acts Manual :"—

"In one case at least the bye-laws provide for total exemption from compulsory attendance in the cases of children above ten years of age, who have passed the examination in the Third Standard; in others, the Fourth Standard is adopted; in others, the Fifth; and in some the Sixth. The practice as to partial exemption varies very considerably in the different districts. Some bye-laws contain a clause to the effect that any child of not less than ten years of age, upon his showing to the satisfaction of the board that he is beneficially and necessarily at work, shall be exempt from full attendance. . . . In some rural districts the bye-laws contain special clauses as to attendance in harvest-time and other exceptional periods of field-work."

These remarks seem sufficiently to show what widely-different kinds of compulsion the bye-laws of different school boards may prescribe.

Again, of the boards which have passed bye-laws it is notorious that some make no effort to work them. Thus we have variety to the following extent throughout the country :—Some districts with boards, some without boards; some boards with bye-laws, some boards without bye-laws; some boards with one kind of bye-laws, some boards with another kind; some boards vigorously working their bye-laws, some working them languidly, some not working them at all—a very pretty diversity. And yet it may be presumed that children throughout the country need education with considerable uniformity.

To the above inequalities of the school board system of compulsion, several might be added; but there is not space for more than the most cursory mention of a very few of them. The school board districts, as constituted under the Education Acts, are in many cases most inconvenient areas over which to apply compulsion. Numerous instances might be found of towns, compactly inhabited, and each organised under its own Local Board or Improvement Commissioners, which, for the purposes of the Education Act, are split up between several school-districts. Thus, Heywood in Lancashire, a Local Board district with a population of about 22,000, living in a compact town, is split up into five separate school-districts; and Mossley, a Local Board district with about 11,000 inhabitants, into four different school-districts, of which one is in Lancashire, one in Yorkshire, and two are in Cheshire. Utter confusion, might be

produced in these towns by the existing law of compulsion. At one side of the street, children might be swept off to school by a vigorous board, while the other side, being in a different district and having no board, might have the whole of its youth continuously playing marbles. And cases not unlike this do actually arise. Outside nearly all the large boroughs there is a fringe of districts without school boards, whither the careless parents migrate in order to defy the school board officer. Many of these districts, or parts of them, are divided from the borough by a mere imaginary line, and form one continuous town with it. Indeed, in the manufacturing parts, the population has a distinct tendency to gather into the thickest masses exactly on the line between school-districts; and the reason is obvious. The school-districts, or civil parishes, in a hilly country such as Lancashire and Yorkshire, are usually bounded by the rivers and streams, and upon the rivers and streams arise the manufacturing towns. If compulsion is to be applied in such towns, clearly it is of the first importance that it should be applied by some authority which is recognised on both sides of the water, and over the whole mass of population.

So far of school boards, separately considered. Let us now glance at them in connection with those other agencies of compulsion which we have previously reviewed.

School boards may certainly supplement the educational provisions of the Labour Acts. Thus, a child who is eventually to be employed under the Factory Act 1874, not being eligible for such employment until he is ten years of age, may, if he lives in a school board district, be compelled by the board to go to school from the time he is five—when he first becomes liable to a bye-law—until he is ten, when he goes to work and comes under the Factory Act. So far there is no doubt. But at this point a question arises, “Does the bye-law lose all power over him directly he comes under the Factory Act?” The question arises in this way. By the Education Act, section 74, bye-laws may determine the time during which children are to attend school, “provided that no such bye-law shall be contrary to anything contained in any Act for regulating the education of children employed in labour.” The question is: does this proviso exempt children, who are attending school half-time under the Factory Acts, from the operation of compulsory bye-laws; or may such children be compelled to attend school full time by a bye-law? The point has been much argued, and by high authorities. Some say, the bye-law requirement is not “contrary to” the Factory Act requirement, but is merely an addition to it. The Factory Act does not declare “if you attend school half-time, you need not attend any more;” and it is only such a declaration that would be contravened by the bye-law declaration “you shall attend full time.” No statutory

right was given by the Factory Act to parents and employers to dispose of a child's time, so as to make that time sacred against invasion by the statutory powers given to school boards. The Factory Acts gave no rights. They only limited pre-existing rights. The other side say, if the proviso does not mean that factory children are exempt from bye-laws, it means nothing. It was certainly the intention of Parliament to exempt such children. The Factory Acts do not merely impose a *minimum* of school-attendance, which may be increased without their being contravened. They contain categorical declarations, that a child shall attend school in a certain manner; and it is absurd to say, that such declarations are not contradicted by bye-laws, declaring that he shall attend school in a totally different manner.

This question has recently come before the courts in the case of "Bury v. Cherrybohn," an appeal by the Barnsley school board against the magistrates, upon a summons issued under a bye-law. The judges (Bramwell, Mellor, and Denman) concurred in the decision, that a child was not the less amenable to a bye-law because he attended school in conformity with the Workshop Act. The grounds on which they based this decision were similar to those above stated as arguments in favour of the bye-laws. It should be mentioned that the case for the Workshop Act was not argued before the judges. The only counsel who appeared was for the bye-laws. The judges expressed their regret at this, stating that the question was altogether new to them; and it may, indeed, be doubted whether all the points of it were taken into account.

We have now seen, that the Factory Acts differ from each other in their educational provisions; that none of them agree with the Workshops Act, or the Mines Act, or the Agricultural Children Act, or the enactment relative to out-door relief; further, that no two of these agree with each other; further, that direct compulsion is only applied here and there through the country, in districts so locally situated as to make great confusion, and in such a variety of different manners and degrees that in no two places is it applied quite similarly; further, that difficult questions have arisen between the conflicting claims of direct and indirect compulsion. These facts seem to justify the statement with which we started, that the present law of compulsory education is confused and complicated, and embodied in a variety of Acts which certainly show no agreement, and perhaps show some actual conflict.

What the reform should be, is a question which we seem likely to have amply debated during this Session, and which there are sufficient reasons (even were there space for it) for not attempting to discuss in this paper. Some few principles, however, which seem almost of the nature of axioms may here, in conclusion, be set down.



By what considerations should the character of legislation upon any subject be determined? Surely by a consideration of the character of the persons who are to be the objects of it; of the prejudices which are to be encountered by it; of the good which may be hoped for from it—whether it would be a good universally, or merely a partial good, a good only to certain persons and in certain places and subject to other such limitations. Now, in legislation upon compulsory education, it is clear that the persons for whom the law is intended are the poorest, most ignorant, and stupidest of the population. But these are the very persons who can least understand complexities. And what is the prejudice to be encountered? Clearly the idea, that a man's children are his own, and that nobody from outside has a right to interfere between him and them. This is assumed to be a law of nature; and any positive law, which is to encounter it successfully, must approach as near as may be, in universality and simplicity, to the character of a law of nature. Then, as to the good to be looked for, all compulsion assumes education to be a good of such paramount and universal importance that the parent may no more refuse it, than he may refuse food, to the child. Yet we have legislated as if it was a thing of the value of which different views might be taken in different localities, a thing about which each group of ratepayers might form its own opinion, like systems of lighting, or draining, or paving; and though our legislation presupposed, and was necessarily based upon, the theory that education, like food, could not be refused to the child without criminality, we have so legislated as, in practice, to allow it to be refused with impunity to the child on one side of the street, and only to require it under penalties to be given to the child on the other side.

The above considerations seem to point to a uniform system of compulsion by one simple law. But this again is impossible. Laws, so full of inequalities and complexities as those we have described, cannot be made simple and equal at a stroke. No country ever did so much for education in the time as we have done during these last six years; and if for the tentative and piecemeal legislation, which has effected so much, there were suddenly to be substituted a rigidly uniform measure, the danger of reaction would be great. For some time yet, we must have breaches of uniformity; and neither of the two systems of direct and indirect compulsion can wholly give place to the other. The reasons are too strong for dealing differently with the two classes of children to which these systems respectively apply—the stray sheep, who have to be sought out individually, and the flocks who are “pounded” in places of labour, under an employer whom the law can get at.

JOHN WHITE.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE important discussion in the Cortez at Madrid on the subject of liberty of conscience is a very fair guide to what the true ultramontanes would do, if they ever should get the mastery in Catholic countries. Since the fall of Queen Isabella Spain had tolerated the practice of dissenting faith and worship. Profiting by this toleration some English missionaries and a few Spaniards had set on foot a propagandist movement in favour of Protestantism. No religious agitation resulted from this, so far as the masses were concerned; the well-to-do classes were indifferent and the people ignorant. But in the great towns, at Madrid, at Seville, at Cordova, small Protestant societies were founded, comprising at the outside 7,000 or 8,000 true believers, if we may trust the common report, and possessing a certain number of places of worship, of very modest pretensions, and not at all of a kind to disturb the susceptibilities of the Roman clergy. There was no ground, therefore, for apprehending any abjuration of her ancient faith by Spain. But Rome could not bear that the Holy Land of Catholicism, which had in old days been preserved from heresy by the purifying fires of the stake, should now lose the glorious privilege of absolute religious unity. So the Pope addressed himself directly to the King, to remind him that the Church cannot admit freedom of worship, and that every sovereign who is a good Catholic is bound to punish without pity all those of his subjects who should be audacious enough to question the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility.

Although he was brought up by his mother and by the Jesuits, the young king Alphonso is not, according to all appearances either a bigot or fanatic, and the first minister, Signor Canovas, hardly dreamed of playing the part of Torquemada, merely to please the Vatican. But on the other hand, the restored monarchy which has in face of it a republican party, that is for the moment silenced but is still very powerful, ought to lean on the conservative elements, and at the very head of these are evidently to be placed the Catholic clergy. This was the situation of Napoleon III. in France all through his reign, and it would be the same with any other restored dynasty in that country. It would be indispensable to lean upon the clerical party. But the principles and the demands of the clerical party are incompatible with the ideas and the necessities of modern civilisation. To obey that party is to be undone. To resist it is to be left helpless in presence of the revolutionary parties. To attempt to go half way toward satisfying it, is to embrace a false position, engendering weakness, contradiction, and incoherency. Thus the moment a crisis breaks out, the government falls, because its only partisans are lukewarm and without devotion. Signor Canovas has laid before the Cortez a draft of a constitution, the second article of which gives to the Church all that it can ask, short of the violent proscription of all Protestants. And the terms of the law are so vague that it is easy to draw from it whatever one wishes, even

the interdiction of all dissenting worship. This is the text:—"The Catholic Apostolic Roman religion is the religion of the State. The nation undertakes to maintain its worship and its ministers. No one shall be molested or persecuted on Spanish soil for his political opinions, nor for his particular form of worship, so long as he keeps within the bounds of Christian morality. But no other ceremonies and no other public manifestations than those of the religion of the State shall be permitted."

Prayers and service in a church, a baptism, a public marriage, a burial according to the reformed ritual, are plainly "public manifestations" of a religion other than that of the State. They may therefore be forbidden. All that remains allowable, strictly speaking, is domestic worship and private gatherings, provided that authority does not choose to see in them a conspiracy against public security and the established order. The article proposed by Signor Canovas did not therefore set toleration on any sacred basis, far from that: rather is intolerance and arbitrary authority that are really founded. Nevertheless Rome and the Spanish clergy left no stone unturned to procure the defeat of Article II. Briefs from the Pope and sermons in the churches, petitions from the Spanish ladies, popular agitations, menaces of revolution,—nothing was spared.

The debate opened on May 3. One of the leaders of the reactionary party—called in Spain Moderados, though as a matter-of fact they are partisans of every violent measure,—Signor Fernando Alvarez, formerly a minister of Queen Isabella, proposed the restoration of the intolerant system of the constitution of 1845, which sanctioned the imprisonment of the martyr Matamores because he read the Bible himself and tried to get others to read it. It was Catholic unity, said Signor Alvarez, that made the glory of Spain and preserved its nationality; without that, the country would perish in anarchy. His speech was loudly applauded by the galleries, but his proposal was rejected by 226 votes against 88. This is a measure of the strength of extreme ultramontaniam in the chamber. In the country this strength is quite great enough to intimidate the Government. On May 4, Signor Romero Ortiz in a remarkable speech defended the system of liberty of conscience. Even while accepting for the country the obligation of providing for the maintenance of the Catholic worship, he asked that the article of the Constitution should add:—"The public or private exercise of any other form of worship is for ever guaranteed to all strangers resident in Spain, without further limit than that their religion must be within the universal rules of morality and right. . If any Spanish subjects profess a religion other than the Catholic, they, also, come within the limits of the foregoing paragraph." It is impossible to say less, if toleration is intended to be real and sheltered against all arbitrary measures from the government. Yet the ministry does not go so far, and through Signor Martin Herrera, the Minister of Justice, it resisted the proposal of the liberals, which was rejected. Castelar, in an admirable improvisation that provoked the enthusiastic applause of his very adversaries themselves, tried in vain to secure the acceptance of the principle of liberty of worship, the most precious, the most indisputably just, of all liberties. Signor Canovas del Castillo explained the motives that guided him in framing

Article II. ; he protested his respect for the Concordat of 1851 ; appealed to the universal feeling of the nation, and while proclaiming the admissibility of dissenters to public employments, declared them to be excluded from all scholastic functions. The bill of the Government was voted by a great majority. But Signor Canovas was afraid of provoking the anger of the Holy Father. King Alphonso addressed to Pius IX. a very humble and contrito letter, in which he assures him that all the rights of the Church shall remain untouched. The Pope acknowledged the letter very coldly, and reserves all his rights. All this gives some idea of the degree of independence that is to be enjoyed by the civil power in any country that desires to remain on good terms with Rome. King Alphonso should take care. If, in order to secure the support of the clergy, of the great nobles, and certain rural districts, he chills the liberal feeling of the large towns, which is a very powerful force, he will be compromising the future of his dynasty. By its literature and its journals, the action of France upon Spain is very great. So long as the Republic and liberal ideas carry the day on the north of the Pyrenees, it will be the height of imprudence to attempt a clerical reaction in the Peninsula. To do so would only be to sow the seed of a new revolution.

On the other side of the Atlantic the old Spanish colonies treat their mother, the Holy Church, with less deference. The republic of Ecuador, which was lately quoted by the Pope along with Belgium as a model state, has abruptly changed its course and broken with Rome. In Venezuela they have resolved that the Catholic faith is to lose all its privileges, and that the priests and bishops shall be chosen directly by the faithful. This is nothing less than an ecclesiastical revolution like that which took place at Geneva and in the catholic portion of the canton of Berne. When the population is sincerely devoted to the Church, as is the case in Ireland, such measures as these will not weaken the catholic hierarchy ; but otherwise they are likely to provoke schisms.

The great event of the month is the meeting of the Chancellors of the three Empires at Berlin. Europe may congratulate herself on the results of the interview, for it furnishes—so they assure us—new guarantees for peace. Last month we tried to show two things. On the one hand, the views of Austria and Russia on the oriental imbroglio were palpably diverging, and that such divergences could not fail to become more sharply accented, if Servia and Montenegro took part in the struggle to support the cause of the insurgents. On the other hand, we showed that war could scarcely issue from these differences, because five out of the six great powers are keenly anxious for peace. Russia, who has always been accused of stirring up trouble and wishing for war, cannot really wish it, because there is no advantage that she could get from it. England, Austria, and Germany united would bar her road to Constantinople. Austria evidently desires peace for a hundred reasons that everybody can see for himself. Italy, if her statesmen do not altogether lose their heads, is devoted to peace for all time. England is pacific, because she is rich, commercial, humane, and sensible. France, become very sage since she

has been a Republic, is busy about her great industrial exhibition. As for Germany, she cannot fight by herself, and she is even making advances to France that are not absolutely repulsed. The manufacturers of the two nations are appointing a rendezvous at Paris in 1878, to dispute the laurel of industry and skill; not soldiers, to try the comparative destroying power of chassepot rifles and Krupp guns. Given therefore, on one side, divergences of view on the subject of Turkish affairs, and on the other the impossibility of settling them by the sword, the best plan for smoothing away difficulties was to examine them in common in close personal conversation. Hence the meeting at Berlin of Prince Gortschakoff, Prince Bismarck, and Count Andrassy, under the auspices of the two Emperors William and Alexander.

The first interview of the Emperors, which took place at the station, was extremely cordial. All Berlin made a holiday, and the reception of the Russian Emperor was enthusiastic. He deserved it, for both in 1866 and 1870 he showed himself Germany's most devoted friend. People observed with lively satisfaction that he seemed in good health, and that there was no need yet for disquiet as to the contingency of seeing him replaced by a successor less sympathetic towards German greatness. The Emperor William did the honours of the capital and of his great army with all the vigour of a young man, and seemed suddenly and wholly to have thrown off the indisposition which had hindered him only three weeks before from going to salute Queen Victoria. Years appear to have no hold on this German of the antique time. Prince Bismarck is less strong in health. He was unable to be present at the banquets and at the court receptions. But he worked most laboriously with the other two chancellors, between whom he had no great difficulty in keeping a good understanding. The points agreed upon are said to be these. An armistice for two months, during which the Turks and the Insurgents should preserve their respective positions. The maintenance of the Andrassy programme, to be completed by the addition of certain articles borrowed from the manifesto of the Insurgents. United action of the six great powers, to superintend the execution of the programme. If other measures should be indispensable, they should be taken after an understanding with the other powers. France and Italy are said to have given their adhesion, but England has refused.

The advantages gained by Mukhtar Pasha in the environs of Niksics have improved the position of Turkey by arresting the intervention of Servia, which had previously seemed very close at hand. But on the other hand the assassination of the consuls of France and Germany at Salonica is the symptom of a grave peril for the future. Mahometan fanaticism is in an excited mood on every side. At Damascus, at Smyrna, at Beyrout, at Constantinople even, foreigners are alarmed for their security, and are dispatching their families westward. For the moment, the telegraph brings us more reassuring news. But it is certain that a very slight incident would be enough to let loose Musulman rage, and in that case the independence of Turkey would be at an end. Nothing could then prevent the intervention of European troops and the occupation of the menaced points. Lord

Stratford de Redcliffe's letter to the *Times* newspaper shows what a feeling of antipathy Turkey is stirring in Europe. There is the most persevering champion of the integrity of the Ottoman empire, the statesman who was at the bottom of the Crimean War,—declaring that henceforth the independence of the Porte is an impossibility, and that Europe has no longer any interest in maintaining it. For twenty years, he says, Turkey has enjoyed complete peace at home and abroad. And to what condition has the Sultan's administration brought the country? It has produced bankruptcy; a disastrous insurrection; general disquiet; the intervention of foreign powers; and perhaps a European war. According to Lord Stratford, the evil being general, every local remedy must be impotent. The Porte must be forced to recognise the equality of all classes before the civil law, to reform the fiscal administration, to admit Christians into the army, to compose the council of state and also the provincial councils partly of no-Muslims, to establish a ministry of commerce. These reforms ought to be stipulated for with the Sultan, and their execution placed under the supervision of a mixed and responsible commission. What Lord Stratford seeks, therefore, is nothing short of the reduction of the Sultan to a condition of tutelage. But then, as has been said, it would be simpler and more effective to dethrone the Sultan, than to govern in his name.

These events show how completely Russia has been in the right in maintaining, as she has done for so many years, that the Sick Man is marching to his end, and that it would be right and expedient to arrange for the succession. It was because the Emperor Nicholas had a clear sight of all this, and because he confided to England the results of his diagnosis, that Lord Stratford worked for a declaration of war against him. The brilliant and glorious results of that war are before our eyes. It is Russia again who has the honours of the Berlin meeting. The Andrassy programme having come to nothing, it is now the Gortschakoff programme that is submitted to the powers, and in fact we may say that the direction of the moral pressure that is being exerted on the Porte has passed from the hands of Austria to the hands of Russia. This is the only advantage that Russia can *as yet* derive from oriental complications. She cannot dream of territorial conquests, but what she may desire is first that the Ottoman power should grow weaker, and that the Turkish empire should continue its process of disintegration; secondly, that she should figure in the eyes of all the Slaves as the champion of the future interests of their race. Russia secures these two advantages at the present moment. The Germans, and especially the Hungarians, are not fond of the Slaves. Austria, which is governed by Germans and Hungarians, does not show herself favourable to the complete emancipation of the Slaves. She gives succour to the refugees from the insurgent provinces. She does not pronounce against these provinces; nay, she even supports some of their demands from the humanitarian point of view, but she has no desire to see the establishment in the Balkan of an independent Slavic confederation. In a word, the policy of Austria is Hungarian policy. That of Russia is Slavic policy. It is inevitable, therefore, that all over the Slavic world,—among the Czechs, the Slavonians, the Croats, the Servians, the Montenegrins, the

Ruthenians, the Bulgarians,—Russia should be winning the popularity that Austria either cannot or will not dispute with her, by making herself frankly and ostentatiously the champion of Slavonia.

We see nearly always in the affairs of this world that the state which defends the good cause, the cause of the future, gains the day at last, even if it has to pass through never so severe an ordeal. Piedmont finished by attaining its end, in spite of the defeat of Novara, because it defended the cause of Italian nationality. Prussia had a similar destiny, in spite of the humiliations of Olmütz, because it represented Germanic unity. In the East, if we rise above the accidents and uncertainties of the passing hour, what is the future that offers itself to our sight? Evidently the close of Turkish domination, and the emancipation of the Slavic peoples. The moment is uncertain, but the accomplishment of the horoscope is assured. It may be that the present crisis is not mortal for Turkey, and that by means of concessions and compromises the insurrection may be appeased. It may be, too, that an explosion of Musulman fanaticism may impose upon the powers the duty of intervention, and the task of putting an end to a government that is no longer able to rein in the savage passions of its subjects. This is the region of the unknown and the accidental. But in one fashion or another the barbaric dominion of the Turk will cease. That is the theme that Russia preaches in season and out of season, and she has acted logically in consequence. Every day events show how right she has been, and augment her influence. The chief part properly falls to him whose vision is clearest. We now see that England has missed her way in the affairs of the East. It will be fortunate if she is able to turn with resolution into another path. The best way of annulling, or at least of counterbalancing, Russian influence in the East, by no means consists in trying to checkmate Russia, when she places herself at the service of humanity and the future. It is proper, on the contrary, to support her, and to act in the same direction, and if need be, to speak louder and more definitely. If things are rightly understood, there ought not to be in Eastern affairs the slightest element of dissension or conflict. Save certain slight shades of difference as to details of execution, the great powers ought to be of one mind in following the same end, the entire emancipation of the Balkan Peninsula; if a military occupation is indispensable, then it ought to be made by common agreement and at common cost. There is a rumour of laying this duty on the Italians. Italy has no business to derange the equilibrium of her budget, simply in order to fulfil gratuitously the functions of European policeman. Young states, like young men, are often in a great hurry to play any part that gives them importance. It is well to distrust these restless impulses of juvenile vanity. If intervention is necessary, as the interest concerned is a European interest, it is for Europe to pay the cost. Perhaps it would be no bad occasion to affirm identity of view and community of interests among the great powers. People often mock at those Europeans who dream of a United States of Europe, governed by an Amphictyonic council. Have we not under our eyes, on the subject of eastern affairs, something very like this? The three chancellors examine

the situation together ; they come to an agreement upon the resolution to be taken, they draw up a memorandum and submit it to the other powers. Is not this exactly the realisation of "European concert" ?

Such concert naturally tends to peace. The Emperor Alexander arrived at Berlin, bearing on his coat the crosses of the great orders of Prussia, Austria, and Russia. "Here," he says, placing his hand on these decorations, "is the base of my policy." At Pesth (May 18) in reply to the address of the Delegations, the Emperor Francis Joseph uses the following expressions :—"The events in the East have only strengthened my resolution and that of the two great neighbouring States to draw more closely and intimately the relations which have already existed between our Empires. I fully trust that by this, as well as by the united efforts and sincere co-operation of the other European Powers, peace will be maintained. I hope, likewise, that the efforts of the Powers to assist the Porte in its task of a lasting pacification of the insurgent provinces will not be without result."

France has less reason than any other power to take any but a cheerful view of things. She is now the most highly favoured power in Europe. Detached from foreign affairs, she watches with philosophic eye oriental complications where she has nothing to gain and little to lose. She crowns the designs for the Great Exhibition of 1878. It is the sign of a quiet conscience to venture on preparation for a future so remote. Two years ! What unforeseen fortunes, what catastrophes, may they bring ! The great advance in France consists in this : the nation is satisfied with its government, and the government has no fear of the nation—a novel state of things for France. The cause of the change is easy to understand. The revolutionary elements were intent before all things on the Republic. This they now possess, but they are still fearful of losing it. So they have become conservative. M. Gambetta, who commands the floods and hurricanes of the great democratic sea, imposes on it calm and respect for law. The royalists understand that monarchy could only be restored if the republic were to founder in a tempest of anarchy, and they are not fanatics enough to wish to erect the throne on the ruins of their country. It is only the extreme Bonapartists and the clericals who try hard to stir up trouble and confusion in the land. But they are powerless. So long as the peasant is content, Bonapartism can only make itself ridiculous. The peasants have no reason to overthrow a system that the very seasons and harvests seem to favour in a special manner. The established system is republican ; so they vote and will continue to vote for republicans.

Incidents that at another moment would have provoked serious agitation, have not troubled the deep and universal calm. M. Waddington proposes to restore to the representatives of the State the right of conferring the academic degrees that are requisite for the practice of law and of medicine. The mixed jury is suppressed. At the same time the private faculties and universities preserve perfect freedom in training their pupils. This is the rational system. It may be held that no diploma in proof of capacity is necessary to plead a cause or cure a patient, although this system, which has been tried in America and at Geneva, has not produced very good



results. But if we think that in the interests of the public, and above all in the interests of knowledge, certain guarantees are necessary, then it is evidently the office of the state to see that these guarantees are adequate and genuine. It is a question of a measure of police, and that is plainly exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Government. What is to be controlled is the studies in the private universities. It is a mockery to surrender this control to the very institutions which ought to undergo it. Yet this is the exorbitant privilege which the previous ministry in France had conceded to the Catholic universities. Now that the government seek to take it away from them, the bishops are setting to work to organize a religious agitation. First they held a rather noisy meeting in Paris. Then the clerical newspapers launched petitions to be signed by the faithful. They raised loud cries of persecution; they declared that violence is being done to all the great principles of property, freedom, equity. But their cries have found no echo. The bishops and their organs are left stranded, and the country remains perfectly tranquil.

M. Ricard, the excellent Minister of the Interior, has been suddenly cut off, and the Marshal, who decidedly is learning his part as constitutional President, replaces him by another member of the Left, from whom much is hoped, M. Marcère. The change was effected in such a way as to show that the machinery of the republican government is working with due regularity. The discussion on the Amnesty, and the funeral of M. Michelet, would prove, it was feared, too good opportunities to be missed by the Irreconcilables of the Chamber and the street, for stirring the excitable population of Paris, ready as it has so often been for any movement in the direction of opposition. Already the Bonapartist journals, on the watch for anything to disturb opinion, had announced that tumultuous gatherings would take place, that cries of *Vive l'amnistie* would be heard, and that there might even be an attempted insurrection. All passed off with unbroken order. At Versailles some speeches were made in favour of the Amnesty; one of them, that of M. Clémenceau was very remarkable. The proposal was defeated by an enormous majority. At Paris a considerable and sympathetic crowd followed the funeral procession of the famous historian, but the people, following the watchword of their chiefs, did not utter a single seditious cry. The Bonapartists and the clericals were reduced to saying that the present government has fallen off, and that it has no longer any of the energy of the men of 1830 and of 1848.

Germany is passing through an economic crisis of great severity. On all sides manufactories are closing; workmen are out of employment; commercial and financial houses are failing. The strain is intense, and it is general. Whence does it proceed? Some persons attribute it to the enormous armaments, and they declare that the German Empire must desire war in order to relieve itself of its burdens. This is a mistake. No doubt the military expenses of Germany and Austria are very considerable, and devour unproductively a portion of their available resources. We can only applaud, therefore, those who like Herr Adolf Fishhof of Vienna, propose a general system of reduced armaments; or those legislative

assemblies which, like the Austro-Hungarian Delegations, call for a diminution of the army by 30,000 men. But without a general agreement, that is not to be hoped for at such a time as this, no head of a state and no minister would be willing to take the responsibility of diminishing the defensive forces of his country. Germany does not succumb under the weight of her budget; she has no debts: her taxes are heavy, but not excessive, and they come in with regularity. The intensity of the industrial crisis across the Rhine depends on other causes. It is nothing short of an economic revolution that is coming to pass, and that has been precipitated by the five milliards of the indemnity. These milliards have made nobody the richer, but they entered abruptly into circulation, and being placed for the time at the disposal of the banks, they produced extensive facilities for credit. Hence resulted a prodigious and factitious expansion of industrial enterprises. On all sides joint-stock companies sprang into existence to realise sources of natural wealth of a very restricted kind: for relatively speaking, the country is not rich in resources. As the prices of everything went up, all these companies, all the manufacturers, all the merchants, all the shopkeepers, made money and spent it in proportion. There was an outburst of prosperity such as had never been seen before, and especially at Berlin. There population went up rapidly: accommodation fell short; houses and ground went for prices that were simply insensate. As there was not labour enough to meet this extraordinary development of production, wages became marvellously high.

As a consequence of this general spread of wealth, habits changed. In Germany all classes used to live simply. Products were only middling in quality, because people wanted them cheaply. Coming from London or Paris into Germany, you are struck by the *commonness* of the articles in the shop-windows. As these articles no longer answered the new requirements, orders were sent abroad. The rich families of Berlin sent for all their furniture and their finest clothes from Paris. They even brought French artisans to execute the joinery and decoration of the new buildings. The superiority of the French workman is so indisputable that even Prince Bismarck did not scruple to proclaim it in the open parliament. The excess of imports over exports soon turned the exchange against Germany, and money travelled back along the roads to France and England, whence the payment of the indemnity had brought it, contrary to the usual current of commerce. At the same time the German government, drawn on by the abstract theories of the economists, wished to supply a currency composed solely of gold, to the exclusion of silver. An exclusively gold currency may suit a country like England, which by its immense commerce commands the exchanges of the whole world, and draws to itself the precious metals of both hemispheres. It is open to such a country to take the metal that it prefers, though the exclusion of silver exposes it to frequent drains of gold, which are extremely troublesome, and though for its relations with India and China it has constant need of silver. Germany, which has not the commercial advantages of England, and which has nearly always the exchange against her, will have great difficulty in keeping her gold coinage. Of the 1200 million marks that the

Empire had coined, no less than one-third is said to have already gone abroad, and the rest is kept by the Banks, and they, in order to keep it, have to resort to high rates of discount. Credit therefore has become contracted. On the other side, Germany wished to regulate the issue of notes, and she called in the small ones. The result of this was a scarcity in the means of circulation, and the contraction of the exchanges. All this hastened and aggravated the crisis that must naturally have succeeded the excesses of speculation and the exaggerated expansion of business after 1870.

So long as Germany is bent on disputing with France and England for the division of the gold of which she stands in need as an instrument of exchange, she will find herself hampered. The medium of circulation will be scarce, and the different instruments of credit will fail in replacing it. Already at the present moment Germany does not succeed in selling the silver which she seeks to drive out of circulation. She has only sold about 100 millions of marks, and in so doing she has reduced the value of this metal 10 per cent.; she has troubled the money market of the whole world; forced France and her monetary allies and confederates to limit the coining of silver; and rendered extremely detrimental the remittances from India to England. Thus Germany has done harm to others as well as to herself. The penalty is an industrial crisis more intense than such a crisis in other countries. The best remedy to which Germany could resort would be to admit the two metals as legal standards. In this way she will always have enough, and she will not have to fetter credit, in order to keep it. It is to be regretted that the well-to-do classes are abandoning their habits of simplicity and thrift, which were one of the sources of German greatness and power. The imitation of the elegances of France and the sumptuosities of England, will not bring happiness or good fortune. Let her remember Frederick the Second; he wore threadbare clothes, but grudged nothing to science or schools.

The *Kulturkampf* against the Church is lulling. The government continues to expel, imprison, and fine a few obscure priests. But the Bishops hold their peace and wait upon events. They recently met at Echternach, where every year at Whitsuntide people indulge in a singular dance in honour of the patron saint of the place. The holy procession takes three leaps forward and two backwards. Is it in the same way that the hierarchy means to do battle with the imperial government? The Pope is said to be ill; he is declared to be growing weaker; and there is even a report that the representatives of the Powers at Rome met together to examine the choice of a successor. Meanwhile, the Holy Father continues to give to the true believers who visit him counsels of gentleness and Christian charity. In his last discourse he exhorted the Catholics to strive against heretics and infidels, and he recalled the exploits of their forefathers in the Albigensian crusade, that first edition of the Bartholomew massacre, which drowned in blood the poetry and civilisation of Provence. How is the Pope to escape such ideas? Every day in the Vatican he traverses the Sala Regia, consecrated to the triumph of the Church, where Vasari painted by order of Gregory XIII. three frescoes representing the principal episodes of the St. Bartholomew and the massacre

of the Huguenots—which made Stendal say that the palace of the popes is the only place in the world where assassination is publicly glorified.

Turning to England, we find little to notice. The fate of the opposition to the change in the Royal Title justifies our estimate of the extremely moderate amount of popular feeling in the matter. Lord Hartington showed his usual sound judgment in checking the anxiety of some of his followers or colleagues to fight a hot battle upon a question about which the liberals in the country have for the most part held a half-cynical neutrality. Surely a political party loses its self-respect in expending so much virtuous indignation on one of the most ridiculous trifles that ever raised a debate, instead of reserving its force for some real attack on popular institutions or liberal principles. Members of parliament, liberals no less than conservatives, constantly mistake the bustle and gossip and feverishness of Westminster and Pall Mall for public emotion. They excite and fret one another, and then think that their friends in the constituencies are excited and fretted in the same degree. The constituencies are really attending to their daily business like sensible men, and prudently decline to be alarmed or exasperated by every storm which it may suit pushing politicians to raise in the Westminster tea-cup. One incident in the unedifying episode of the new addition to the Queen's titles deserves to be regretted. Mr. Lowe allowed himself to make a statement as to the Queen's having proposed this addition to her title to two previous ministers, who declined to meet her wishes. Mr. Disraeli was able to show this to be an error, and Mr. Lowe had to apologise. There is no more disagreeable sight in public life than thus to see a man of true public spirit, fine scientific intellect, and signal honesty, receive even a passing humiliation from a man with such a political character as the present Prime Minister.

The defeat of the government on the Irish Sunday Closing resolution was the most really satisfactory vote of the session (May 12); and this not at all *because* it was a defeat of government. From that point of view it was wholly insignificant. A majority of the Irish people desire a law to close public houses in Ireland on a Sunday. This is clearly a domestic matter, just as the similar law which the Scottish people have for Scotland is a domestic matter. If the Scotch have a Forbes Mackenzie Act, because they asked for it, why should not the Irish have a similar kind of law when they ask for it? The affirmation by the House of Commons of Mr. Smyth's resolution, declares that they ought to have such a law if they wish. Every man must welcome this sign of political right-mindedness, who attaches any sense to the principle of parliamentary representation, or who values popular government, or who distrusts legislative centralisation, or who knows the meaning of political expediency. The Irish representatives are practically unanimous; so are the Irish people. The latter proposition has been denied. If they were unanimous, it has been said, the public houses would close of themselves, because nobody would go to them. The gross miscarriage of thought here is obvious. What the Irish people are unanimous in desiring is that the temptation and opportunity of Sunday drinking should be withdrawn by legislative interference.

This is a very different thing from being unanimous in possessing strength of will enough to resist the temptation. Upon the merits of the question we pronounce no opinion. It may be inexpedient that the majority should coerce the minority into sobriety, and it may be unwise to do anything to interfere with the cheerfulness and recreation of the one holiday of the week, though the cheerfulness of wives and children ought to be taken into account as well as that of the husband. However these things may be, the whole question is just one of those which a country holding those relations to the imperial government which Ireland holds to England and Scotland, should be allowed to settle for itself. It is nonsense to talk of Ireland as being "an integral portion of the empire for legislative purposes" in the sense that she has as little claim to have her special wishes consulted as if she were Dorsetshire. As if to shut our eyes to vital differences of religion, differences of temperament, differences of tradition, were to efface them.

Just as those who desire a more extensive application of the principles of popular self-government to Ireland might have rejoiced if Mr. Smyth's resolution had been rejected, so those who, like ourselves, hope to see the Church of England disestablished, may rejoice at the kind of opposition offered by such men as Lord Salisbury to the resolution of Lord Granville in favour of opening the national churchyards. If a workman had made a speech on some labour question as remarkable for political blindness and prejudice and irritating heat of expression as was Lord Salisbury's speech on the Burial Resolutions, we should have heard how unfit the labouring classes are for the possession of political power. However, Lord Salisbury's gibes will not hinder him from being, whether he likes it or not, a participator in the measure which his government will bring in upon the subject next year.

The Bill for extending elementary education is another and a characteristic specimen of recent Conservative legislation, of which the Merchants Shipping Bill and the Bill for constituting a High Court of Appeal are prominent examples. It is evidently a mistake to call such measures reactionary, for modern Toryism has not purpose or definiteness enough for even backward movement, but leaves this congenial exertion to the too moderate politicians of the Liberal party. Our Conservatives are happiest in contemplative inaction, and if public opinion on any subject applies a gentle pressure, they stagger aimlessly forward, till the impetus is exhausted and a fresh resting-place is temporarily secured.

Lord Sandon's statement was a complete admission that compulsion is necessary in England to secure the universality of primary instruction. To most persons the confession suggests, as a natural consequence, direct compulsion applied through representative machinery. The experience of Scotland, and of the working of the Education Act of 1870, which has placed more than ten millions of the population under compulsory bye-laws, is a sufficient answer to those who assert that such a prescription would necessarily be unpopular or ineffective. The expedient is however too simple and straightforward to form the groundwork of a conservative policy.

If compulsion be inevitable, at least it can be called by some other name; and accordingly a cumbrous disguise is found which will impede its action, but may conceal its real character and intention. Under present circumstances, educationists must be thankful for small mercies, and they will perhaps find ground for the hope that, if the Bill becomes law, it will do something to reduce the great mass of ignorance which past legislation has failed to reach. But the clumsy devices by which this end is sought to be accomplished are certain to produce a new crop of difficulties and objections which cannot be contemplated without dismay.

Lord Sandon acknowledges that 1,800,000 children are still without any satisfactory education, and his first object appears to have been the discovery of a method of enforcing compulsion without the establishment of School Boards, which are the *bête noire* of the denominationalists, and which they have done their best to render unpopular by the most persistent misrepresentation of their cost. Accordingly the Bill provides that Town Councils and Boards of Guardians may, under certain circumstances, make and enforce Compulsory Bye Laws in districts where no School Board has been elected. As regards Town Councils, there seems to be no objection to this proposal, provided that the powers conferred on School Boards for the provision and maintenance of schools are given to these bodies at the same time as the power to make bye-laws. In this way any deficiency in the accommodation, arising from the growth of the population, or the abandonment of existing schools, will be supplied; and the Town Councils will act as School Boards in all respects, without the expense of a separate election and an independent staff of officials. Boards of Guardians, however, stand on a very different footing. By the mode of their election, coupled with the provisions which constitute a number of *ex officio* guardians, these bodies now represent property. The working-class and the agricultural labourers, who are chiefly interested in the work these authorities are to be called on to perform, have absolutely no voice in their election. The Government, which has always professed so tender a regard for individual liberty, actually proposes to subject millions of the population to the operation of compulsory laws, enforced by an authority on which they are entirely unrepresented.

As if to make the process still more unpalatable, the Boards are permitted to delegate their powers to a Committee of three, which may be expected to consist of the squire, the parson, and their nominee. This trio will be able to compel all the children in the Parish to attend the existing denominational schools, which in the majority of cases will be those connected with the Church of England. Even this may be better than that the children should remain ignorant, but it is a singular mode of popularising education in the rural districts. And the opposition which it will be certain to provoke is likely to compel resort to the alternative of indirect compulsion, which seeks to extort from parents a present sacrifice under threat of a deferred penalty. A "labour pass" indicating the attainment of a certain very limited proficiency is to be exacted from all children before they are permitted to go to work. Passing over the miserably low standard at which the test is fixed, and the extraordinary

provision that when a child has once obtained a certificate he may be taken into employment in any subsequent year, without any further certificate being required—a provision which, for the first four years after the passing of the Act, will enable a child under fourteen to be employed if he has passed the second standard of the revised code—it is clear that the requirements of the Bill will be eluded by all children working at home and under domestic control. And even when this is not the case, it is unlikely that the indifferent, ignorant, and apathetic parents, who are, *ex hypothesi*, the subjects of the measure, will provide education for their children in view of the distant contingency that in from five to ten years later they may wish them to go to work. Thus the Bill will create an immense class of children who do not go to school and may not go to work. The only provision for dealing with them is contained in the clauses for securing their committal to industrial schools. Here is indeed a hopeful prospect! The experience of these institutions shows that in spite of the terms on which committals are made and of the exertions of officers specially appointed for the purpose, it is found impossible to collect from the parents more than a fraction of the cost of maintenance; and if the community is about to undertake the provision of food and clothing for all children whom parental neglect has condemned to ignorance, a direct inducement will be offered for such negligence, and an expenditure incurred before which the alleged extravagance of School Boards will pale its ineffectual fires. Besides, the existing industrial schools are nearly full, and there is no obligation in any one to provide more. Where, then, is the accommodation to be found for the vast multitude of “wastrel” children whom Lord Sandon proposes to manufacture in this wholesale way? And, lastly, what will be the effect on these children of their close association with others of the quasi or actual criminal class?

The great merit of the Bill is negative. It contains none of the provisions so confidently expected by the ultra-denominationalists for restricting the discretion of School Boards as to religious teaching, and for relieving the subscribers to voluntary schools of their share of the education rate. The only concession made is the removal of one of the limitations to the amount of grant earned in what are defined as “poor districts.” It is a curious evidence of the blundering way in which the Bill has been prepared that under the definition given the great Borough of Birmingham will be a “poor district,” while the agricultural county of Dorset will be deemed a rich one. But in any case the boon, like the half-hour conceded to those other pillars of the Conservative administration—the publicans, is illusory and valueless. The amount deducted last year under the limitation which it is now proposed to remove was under £12,000, and this sum will hardly pay the National Society for the cost of the agitation by which it has been secured.

May 29, 1876.







